

# General Education Assessment Practices Survey 2009

## Research and Emerging Research Universities Accountability Peer Group Responses

Number of responses from peer group: 9

### Structure of and Resources for General Education Assessment

- 1) Which offices and/or groups are responsible for the following aspects of assessing general education competencies at your institution? (Choose all that apply)

Peer Group	Selecting Assessment Methods	Developing Assessment Instruments	Collecting & Analyzing Data	Reviewing Assessment Findings	Other Assessment Work
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	5 (55.56%)	5 (55.56%)	3 (33.33%)	6 (66.67%)	3 (33.33%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	3 (33.33%)	3 (33.33%)	3 (33.33%)	4 (44.44%)	2 (22.22%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	5 (55.56%)	7 (77.78%)	7 (77.78%)	6 (66.67%)	4 (44.44%)
Office of Institutional Research	2 (22.22%)	5 (55.56%)	7 (77.78%)	3 (33.33%)	5 (55.56%)
General education assessment committee	5 (55.56%)	5 (55.56%)	5 (55.56%)	5 (55.56%)	4 (44.44%)
Faculty members	8 (88.89%)	9 (100%)	9 (100%)	6 (66.67%)	3 (33.33%)
Deans/Division Chairs/Dept. Chairs	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (11.11%)	0 (0%)

All Two-Year Institutions (62)	Selecting Assessment Methods	Developing Assessment Instruments	Collecting & Analyzing Data	Reviewing Assessment Findings	Other Assessment Work
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	32 (51.61%)	19 (30.65%)	19 (30.65%)	49 (79.03%)	18 (29.03%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	3 (4.84%)	2 (3.23%)	2 (3.23%)	6 (9.68%)	1 (1.61%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	18 (29.03%)	21 (33.87%)	29 (46.77%)	29 (46.77%)	17 (27.42%)
Office of Institutional Research	17 (27.42%)	23 (37.1%)	37 (59.68%)	29 (46.77%)	23 (37.1%)
General education assessment committee	25 (40.32%)	23 (37.1%)	27 (43.55%)	30 (48.39%)	12 (19.35%)
Faculty members	47 (75.81%)	52 (83.87%)	39 (62.9%)	44 (70.97%)	16 (25.81%)
Deans/Division Chairs/Dept. Chairs	8 (12.9%)	6 (9.68%)	8 (12.9%)	6 (9.68%)	3 (4.84%)

All Four-Year Institutions (33)	Selecting Assessment Methods	Developing Assessment Instruments	Collecting & Analyzing Data	Reviewing Assessment Findings	Other Assessment Work
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	13 (39.39%)	9 (27.27%)	7 (21.21%)	23 (69.7%)	12 (36.36%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	8 (24.24%)	6 (18.18%)	5 (15.15%)	10 (30.3%)	7 (21.21%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	14 (42.42%)	14 (42.42%)	20 (60.61%)	22 (66.67%)	14 (42.42%)
Office of Institutional Research	7 (21.21%)	12 (36.36%)	19 (57.58%)	11 (33.33%)	13 (39.39%)
General education assessment committee	17 (51.52%)	15 (45.45%)	14 (42.42%)	21 (63.64%)	10 (30.3%)
Faculty members	23 (69.7%)	27 (81.82%)	24 (72.73%)	24 (72.73%)	12 (36.36%)
Deans/Division Chairs/Dept. Chairs	1 (3.03%)	1 (3.03%)	2 (6.06%)	4 (12.12%)	2 (6.06%)

2) Please briefly describe the process through which your institution assesses general education competencies.

See attached list of responses

3) Does your institution have one or more staff positions whose primary focus is learning assessment?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	9 (100%)	21 (33.87%)	26 (78.79%)
No	0 (0%)	41 (66.13%)	7 (21.21%)

3a) (If yes) In what office or offices is this position or positions located? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (21)	Four-Year Institutions (26)
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	7 (77.78%)	9 (42.86%)	12 (46.15%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	1 (11.11%)	0 (0%)	3 (11.54%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	5 (55.56%)	10 (47.62%)	17 (65.38%)
Office of Institutional Research	4 (44.44%)	7 (33.33%)	10 (38.46%)
Academic colleges or departments	3 (33.33%)	1 (4.76%)	5 (19.23%)

4) What resources are available at your institution to support assessment of general education competencies? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Assessment training for faculty or staff as part of formal professional development activities (e.g. in-service sessions, orientation for new faculty)	5 (55.56%)	44 (70.97%)	19 (57.58%)
Optional assessment workshops for faculty or staff	8 (88.89%)	40 (64.52%)	26 (78.79%)
One-on-one consultation with faculty	9 (100%)	44 (70.97%)	30 (90.91%)
Funding for faculty or staff to attend assessment conferences or training	7 (77.78%)	53 (85.48%)	27 (81.82%)
Funding or release time for faculty or staff to work on assessment	2 (22.22%)	22 (35.48%)	9 (27.27%)
Books/reference materials on assessment distributed to faculty or staff	7 (77.78%)	44 (70.97%)	23 (69.7%)

5) Does your institution use centralized software for assessment data collection and reporting?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	7 (77.78%)	23 (37.1%)	22 (66.67%)
No	2 (22.22%)	23 (37.1%)	7 (21.21%)
In Process	0 (0%)	16 (25.81%)	4 (12.12%)

5a) (If yes or in process) Which software package do you use or plan to use? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (39)	Four-Year Institutions (26)
Blackboard	1 (14.29%)	6 (15.38%)	7 (26.92%)
Datatel	0 (0%)	3 (7.69%)	1 (3.85%)
Strategic Planning Online (SPOL)	0 (0%)	8 (20.51%)	1 (3.85%)
Task Stream	0 (0%)	2 (5.13%)	4 (15.38%)
Tk20	0 (0%)	1 (2.56%)	1 (3.85%)
TracDat	2 (28.57%)	5 (12.82%)	5 (19.23%)
Weave Online	1 (14.29%)	8 (20.51%)	8 (30.77%)
Locally-developed software	1 (14.29%)	9 (23.08%)	5 (19.23%)
OATS	2 (28.57%)	0 (0%)	2 (7.69%)
Banner	0 (0%)	1 (2.08%)	1 (3.85%)
Other	2 (28.57%)	7 (14.58%)	3 (11.54%)

5b) (If yes or in process) How long have you been using this software package?

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (39)	Four-Year Institutions (26)
In process of adopting	0 (0%)	8 (20.51%)	3 (11.54%)
Less than 1 year	3 (42.86%)	8 (20.51%)	9 (34.62%)
Between 1 and 3 years	2 (28.57%)	5 (12.82%)	3 (11.54%)
3 years	1 (14.29%)	5 (12.82%)	6 (23.08%)
4 or more years	1 (14.29%)	3 (7.69%)	4 (15.38%)
Use multiple programs	0 (0%)	5 (12.82%)	1 (3.85%)

**General Education Assessment Practices**

6) What is the cycle on which your institution assesses all general education competencies and reviews the assessment findings (recognizing that specific competencies may be assessed on a more frequent schedule)?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Every semester	0 (0%)	9 (14.52%)	3 (9.09%)
Every year	6 (66.67%)	25 (40.32%)	12 (36.36%)
Every two years	2 (22.22%)	6 (9.68%)	4 (12.12%)
Every 2-3 years	1 (11.11%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.06%)
Every three years or beyond	0 (0%)	18 (29.03%)	7 (21.21%)
In process of determining	0 (0%)	2 (3.23%)	3 (9.09%)

7) Does your institution use general knowledge and skills exams to assess general education competencies (e.g. CAAP, CLA, MAPP)?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	9 (100%)	17 (27.42%)	29 (87.88%)
No	0 (0%)	41 (66.13%)	1 (3.03%)
In Process	0 (0%)	4 (6.45%)	3 (9.09%)

7a) (If yes) Which standardized exam(s) is/are used to measure general education competencies at your institution? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (21)	Four-Year Institutions (32)
CAAP	1 (11.11%)	9 (42.86%)	7 (21.88%)
CBASE	1 (11.11%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.13%)
CCTST	0 (0%)	1 (4.76%)	1 (3.13%)
CLA	8 (88.89%)	2 (9.52%)	15 (46.88%)
MAPP	0 (0%)	7 (33.33%)	11 (34.38%)
WorkKeys	0 (0%)	2 (9.52%)	0 (0%)
Institutionally-developed exam	0 (0%)	2 (9.52%)	3 (9.38%)
NSF Critical Thinking Assessment	1 (11.11%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.13%)

7b) (If yes) Which students at your institution take the general knowledge and skills exam(s)? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (21)	Four-Year Institutions (32)
All students completing general education and/or core curriculum (e.g. rising junior exam)	0 (0%)	3 (14.29%)	1 (3.13%)
All graduating students	0 (0%)	1 (4.76%)	1 (3.13%)
A sample of students completing general education and/or core curriculum	0 (0%)	11 (52.38%)	5 (15.63%)
A sample of graduating students	2 (22.22%)	4 (19.05%)	4 (12.5%)
A sample of first-year and senior students	8 (88.89%)	2 (9.52%)	23 (71.88%)

8) Which methods of assessing general education competencies are used at your institution and to what extent?

	Institutional Type	Never Used	Used in Past But Not Now	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Course grades in general education and/or core curriculum classes	Peer Group	7 (77.78%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (11.11%)	1 (11.11%)
	Two-Year	16 (25.81%)	12 (19.35%)	2 (3.23%)	11 (17.74%)	21 (33.87%)
	Four-Year	24 (72.73%)	4 (12.12%)	1 (3.03%)	1 (3.03%)	3 (9.09%)
Course grades in more advanced classes that build on general education and/or core curriculum classes	Peer Group	9 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	33 (53.23%)	2 (3.23%)	5 (8.06%)	13 (20.97%)	9 (14.52%)
	Four-Year	27 (81.82%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	1 (3.03%)	1 (3.03%)

	Institutional Type	Never Used	Used in Past But Not Now	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Student work from individual course sections (e.g. quizzes, exams, essays, research papers)	Peer Group	1 (11.11%)	0 (0%)	1 (11.11%)	0 (0%)	7 (77.78%)
	Two-Year	1 (1.61%)	1 (1.61%)	5 (8.06%)	13 (20.97%)	42 (67.74%)
	Four-Year	4 (12.12%)	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	4 (12.12%)	20 (60.61%)
Common exams, exam questions, assignments, and/or grading rubrics to assess student work across course sections	Peer Group	1 (11.11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (22.22%)	6 (66.67%)
	Two-Year	3 (4.84%)	0 (0%)	6 (9.68%)	18 (29.03%)	35 (56.45%)
	Four-Year	2 (6.06%)	0 (0%)	4 (12.12%)	7 (21.21%)	20 (60.61%)
Observations of student performance (e.g. simulations, labs, recitals)	Peer Group	2 (22.22%)	0 (0%)	2 (22.22%)	3 (33.33%)	2 (22.22%)
	Two-Year	6 (9.68%)	0 (0%)	6 (9.68%)	29 (46.77%)	21 (33.87%)
	Four-Year	4 (12.12%)	0 (0%)	7 (21.21%)	13 (39.39%)	9 (27.27%)
Cumulative assessments (e.g. capstone projects, portfolios)	Peer Group	2 (22.22%)	0 (0%)	2 (22.22%)	3 (33.33%)	2 (22.22%)
	Two-Year	14 (22.58%)	0 (0%)	10 (16.13%)	21 (33.87%)	17 (27.42%)
	Four-Year	6 (18.18%)	0 (0%)	9 (27.27%)	13 (39.39%)	5 (15.15%)
Student surveys (e.g. NSSE/CCSSE, CIRP surveys, locally-developed surveys)	Peer Group	1 (11.11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (11.11%)	7 (77.78%)
	Two-Year	7 (11.29%)	2 (3.23%)	4 (6.45%)	18 (29.03%)	31 (50%)
	Four-Year	5 (15.15%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.03%)	6 (18.18%)	21 (63.64%)
Faculty surveys	Peer Group	7 (77.78%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (22.22%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	29 (46.77%)	1 (1.61%)	9 (14.52%)	17 (27.42%)	6 (9.68%)
	Four-Year	19 (57.58%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.03%)	9 (27.27%)	4 (12.12%)
Alumni or graduate surveys	Peer Group	1 (11.11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (33.33%)	5 (55.56%)
	Two-Year	24 (38.71%)	3 (4.84%)	4 (6.45%)	20 (32.26%)	11 (17.74%)
	Four-Year	7 (21.21%)	3 (9.09%)	5 (15.15%)	7 (21.21%)	11 (33.33%)



	Institutional Type	Never Used	Used in Past But Not Now	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Employer surveys or advisory groups	Peer Group	3 (33.33%)	1 (11.11%)	0 (0%)	4 (44.44%)	1 (11.11%)
	Two-Year	19 (30.65%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.61%)	26 (41.94%)	16 (25.81%)
	Four-Year	12 (36.36%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	13 (39.39%)	4 (12.12%)
Student focus groups	Peer Group	7 (77.78%)	0 (0%)	1 (11.11%)	1 (11.11%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	27 (43.55%)	3 (4.84%)	10 (16.13%)	18 (29.03%)	4 (6.45%)
	Four-Year	20 (60.61%)	0 (0%)	7 (21.21%)	6 (18.18%)	0 (0%)
Student success measures (e.g. transfer rates, graduation rates, etc.)	Peer Group	4 (44.44%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (33.33%)	2 (22.22%)
	Two-Year	13 (20.97%)	0 (0%)	3 (4.84%)	9 (14.52%)	37 (59.68%)
	Four-Year	17 (51.52%)	0 (0%)	3 (9.09%)	6 (18.18%)	7 (21.21%)
Data on student performance after transfer or graduation	Peer Group	6 (66.67%)	0 (0%)	2 (22.22%)	1 (11.11%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	14 (22.58%)	0 (0%)	8 (12.9%)	27 (43.55%)	13 (20.97%)
	Four-Year	20 (60.61%)	0 (0%)	5 (15.15%)	5 (15.15%)	3 (9.09%)

9) What strategies are used to involve students in the general education assessment process at your institution? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Course-embedded assessments	7 (77.78%)	61 (98.39%)	28 (84.85%)
In-class administration of a standardized exam	3 (33.33%)	35 (56.45%)	17 (51.52%)
Participation in assessment is required outside of class	2 (22.22%)	8 (12.9%)	8 (24.24%)
Educational/outreach efforts (e.g. explaining the importance of assessment)	4 (44.44%)	14 (22.58%)	11 (33.33%)
Monetary incentives	8 (88.89%)	6 (9.68%)	16 (48.48%)
Non-monetary rewards (e.g. event tickets, prize drawings, etc.)	6 (66.67%)	5 (8.06%)	12 (36.36%)

9a) Which of these strategies (if any) do you find to be most effective?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Course-embedded and in-class assessments	6 (66.67%)	44 (70.97%)	24 (72.73%)
External rewards (monetary or non-monetary)	5 (55.56%)	1 (1.61%)	9 (27.27%)
Required participation	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.06%)
Educational/outreach efforts	1 (11.11%)	0 (0%)	3 (9.09%)
Academic incentives (e.g. bonus points)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.06%)

10) Which of the following options would be most helpful in improving general education assessment practices at your institution? (Choose 3)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
More faculty involvement	5 (55.56%)	28 (45.16%)	18 (54.55%)
More student involvement	2 (22.22%)	8 (12.9%)	5 (15.15%)
Emphasis on assessment by institutional leaders	4 (44.44%)	9 (14.52%)	10 (30.3%)
Including student learning in the institutional strategic plan	0 (0%)	5 (8.06%)	3 (9.09%)
Additional faculty or staff expertise in assessment methods	4 (44.44%)	33 (53.23%)	18 (54.55%)
Better ways to measure student learning outcomes	3 (33.33%)	23 (37.1%)	10 (30.3%)
Additional resources (e.g. staff, funding)	2 (22.22%)	28 (45.16%)	13 (39.39%)
Information about practices and policies at peer institutions	3 (33.33%)	15 (24.19%)	9 (27.27%)
Agreement on general education/core curriculum learning outcomes throughout the state	1 (11.11%)	26 (41.94%)	9 (27.27%)

11) Please describe one or two practices used by your institution to assess general education competencies that you consider to be working well.

See attached list of responses

12) Please describe one or two significant challenges that your institution faces in assessing general education competencies.

See attached list of responses

**Use of General Education Assessment Findings**

13) With whom and how frequently are institutional-level reports on general education assessment findings shared?

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to	Occasionally	Frequently
Academic administrators	Peer Group	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (44.44%)	5 (55.56%)
	Two-Year	3 (4.84%)	7 (11.29%)	16 (25.81%)	35 (56.45%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	9 (27.27%)	19 (57.58%)
Faculty	Peer Group	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (66.67%)	3 (33.33%)
	Two-Year	2 (3.23%)	7 (11.29%)	24 (38.71%)	28 (45.16%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	15 (45.45%)	13 (39.39%)
Staff	Peer Group	3 (33.33%)	1 (11.11%)	3 (33.33%)	2 (22.22%)
	Two-Year	24 (38.71%)	10 (16.13%)	21 (33.87%)	6 (9.68%)
	Four-Year	14 (42.42%)	7 (21.21%)	9 (27.27%)	3 (9.09%)
Students	Peer Group	6 (66.67%)	3 (33.33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	26 (41.94%)	18 (29.03%)	17 (27.42%)	0 (0%)
	Four-Year	17 (51.52%)	9 (27.27%)	4 (12.12%)	3 (9.09%)
Governing boards	Peer Group	2 (22.22%)	1 (11.11%)	5 (55.56%)	1 (11.11%)
	Two-Year	14 (22.58%)	12 (19.35%)	26 (41.94%)	9 (14.52%)
	Four-Year	12 (36.36%)	4 (12.12%)	12 (36.36%)	5 (15.15%)
Accreditors (specialized or SACS)	Peer Group	0 (0%)	1 (11.11%)	5 (55.56%)	3 (33.33%)
	Two-Year	4 (6.45%)	7 (11.29%)	36 (58.06%)	14 (22.58%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	6 (18.18%)	12 (36.36%)	14 (42.42%)
Government regulatory bodies (state or federal)	Peer Group	1 (11.11%)	2 (22.22%)	4 (44.44%)	2 (22.22%)
	Two-Year	11 (17.74%)	8 (12.9%)	25 (40.32%)	17 (27.42%)
	Four-Year	5 (15.15%)	6 (18.18%)	11 (33.33%)	11 (33.33%)

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to	Occasionally	Frequently
Alumni	Peer Group	7 (77.78%)	2 (22.22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	44 (70.97%)	11 (17.74%)	6 (9.68%)	0 (0%)
	Four-Year	23 (69.7%)	7 (21.21%)	3 (9.09%)	0 (0%)
General public	Peer Group	6 (66.67%)	1 (11.11%)	1 (11.11%)	1 (11.11%)
	Two-Year	33 (53.23%)	13 (20.97%)	13 (20.97%)	2 (3.23%)
	Four-Year	21 (63.64%)	6 (18.18%)	5 (15.15%)	1 (3.03%)

14) Who makes decisions about changes to general education and/or the core curriculum based on assessment findings?  
(Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	5 (55.56%)	46 (74.19%)	20 (60.61%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	3 (33.33%)	4 (6.45%)	8 (24.24%)
Academic affairs committee	1 (11.11%)	24 (38.71%)	6 (18.18%)
General education/core curriculum committee	8 (88.89%)	43 (69.35%)	27 (81.82%)
Deans of individual colleges	0 (0%)	11 (17.74%)	16 (48.48%)
Department chairs or departmental undergraduate studies committees	2 (22.22%)	31 (50%)	17 (51.52%)
Faculty members	4 (44.44%)	39 (62.9%)	19 (57.58%)

15) To what extent has your institution used general education competencies assessment findings for each of the following?

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Prepare for institutional accreditation	Peer Group	1 (11.11%)	0 (0%)	3 (33.33%)	5 (55.56%)
	Two-Year	2 (3.23%)	6 (9.68%)	16 (25.81%)	38 (61.29%)
	Four-Year	2 (6.06%)	4 (12.12%)	4 (12.12%)	23 (69.7%)
Prepare for specialized accreditation	Peer Group	3 (33.33%)	1 (11.11%)	3 (33.33%)	2 (22.22%)
	Two-Year	16 (25.81%)	3 (4.84%)	21 (33.87%)	22 (35.48%)
	Four-Year	7 (21.21%)	5 (15.15%)	10 (30.3%)	11 (33.33%)

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Provide data for public accountability (e.g. VSA)	Peer Group	0 (0%)	1 (11.11%)	4 (44.44%)	4 (44.44%)
	Two-Year	33 (53.23%)	9 (14.52%)	17 (27.42%)	3 (4.84%)
	Four-Year	5 (15.15%)	3 (9.09%)	5 (15.15%)	20 (60.61%)
Respond to assessment requirements set by THECB and/or governing board	Peer Group	1 (11.11%)	1 (11.11%)	5 (55.56%)	2 (22.22%)
	Two-Year	2 (3.23%)	6 (9.68%)	22 (35.48%)	32 (51.61%)
	Four-Year	2 (6.06%)	6 (18.18%)	7 (21.21%)	18 (54.55%)
Revise general education competencies	Peer Group	1 (11.11%)	4 (44.44%)	3 (33.33%)	1 (11.11%)
	Two-Year	5 (8.06%)	12 (19.35%)	29 (46.77%)	16 (25.81%)
	Four-Year	4 (12.12%)	13 (39.39%)	9 (27.27%)	7 (21.21%)
Make changes to general education/core curriculum	Peer Group	0 (0%)	5 (55.56%)	3 (33.33%)	1 (11.11%)
	Two-Year	4 (6.45%)	15 (24.19%)	24 (38.71%)	19 (30.65%)
	Four-Year	3 (9.09%)	13 (39.39%)	8 (24.24%)	9 (27.27%)
Refine assessment process and/or measures	Peer Group	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (44.44%)	5 (55.56%)
	Two-Year	5 (8.06%)	16 (25.81%)	16 (25.81%)	25 (40.32%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	11 (33.33%)	17 (51.52%)
Determine student readiness for upper-level coursework	Peer Group	5 (55.56%)	3 (33.33%)	1 (11.11%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	21 (33.87%)	16 (25.81%)	12 (19.35%)	13 (20.97%)
	Four-Year	18 (54.55%)	9 (27.27%)	4 (12.12%)	2 (6.06%)
Align curricula and/or learning outcomes with K-12 and/or feeder colleges/universities	Peer Group	6 (66.67%)	1 (11.11%)	1 (11.11%)	1 (11.11%)
	Two-Year	13 (20.97%)	27 (43.55%)	17 (27.42%)	5 (8.06%)
	Four-Year	16 (48.48%)	8 (24.24%)	5 (15.15%)	4 (12.12%)

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Align curricula and/or learning outcomes between general education and major sequence courses	Peer Group	3 (33.33%)	4 (44.44%)	2 (22.22%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	20 (32.26%)	19 (30.65%)	14 (22.58%)	9 (14.52%)
	Four-Year	12 (36.36%)	11 (33.33%)	6 (18.18%)	4 (12.12%)
Improve teaching (e.g. faculty development programs)	Peer Group	4 (44.44%)	3 (33.33%)	2 (22.22%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	3 (4.84%)	15 (24.19%)	19 (30.65%)	25 (40.32%)
	Four-Year	10 (30.3%)	7 (21.21%)	11 (33.33%)	5 (15.15%)
Make decisions about faculty tenure, promotion, or merit raises	Peer Group	9 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	53 (85.48%)	4 (6.45%)	4 (6.45%)	1 (1.61%)
	Four-Year	29 (87.88%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	0 (0%)
Allocate resources to departments	Peer Group	8 (88.89%)	0 (0%)	1 (11.11%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	41 (66.13%)	10 (16.13%)	9 (14.52%)	2 (3.23%)
	Four-Year	26 (78.79%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	3 (9.09%)
Recruit prospective students	Peer Group	7 (77.78%)	2 (22.22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	53 (85.48%)	4 (6.45%)	5 (8.06%)	0 (0%)
	Four-Year	27 (81.82%)	4 (12.12%)	2 (6.06%)	0 (0%)
Make decisions related to strategic planning	Peer Group	4 (44.44%)	2 (22.22%)	2 (22.22%)	1 (11.11%)
	Two-Year	6 (9.68%)	14 (22.58%)	25 (40.32%)	17 (27.42%)
	Four-Year	11 (33.33%)	9 (27.27%)	8 (24.24%)	5 (15.15%)

16) Has your institution made any recent changes to general education and/or the core curriculum as a result of the assessment process?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	4 (44.44%)	24 (38.71%)	11 (33.33%)
No	1 (11.11%)	21 (33.87%)	13 (39.39%)
In Process	4 (44.44%)	15 (24.19%)	9 (27.27%)

16a) (If yes or in process) Please briefly describe the changes to general education and/or the core curriculum and the reasons for making them.

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (39)	Four-Year Institutions (20)
Defined new general education competencies	3 (37.5%)	1 (2.56%)	5 (25%)
Mapped general education competencies to curriculum	1 (12.5%)	3 (7.69%)	2 (10%)
Reduced number of hours in core curriculum	1 (12.5%)	2 (5.13%)	2 (10%)
Added/dropped general education requirements	1 (12.5%)	6 (15.38%)	2 (10%)
Dropped excess general education courses/streamlined core	1 (12.5%)	4 (10.26%)	1 (5%)
Added/dropped courses based on coverage of general education competencies	0 (0%)	5 (12.82%)	5 (25%)
Changed general education course content	1 (12.5%)	6 (15.38%)	7 (35%)
Changed general education assessment plan	3 (37.5%)	7 (17.95%)	5 (25%)



# General Education Assessment Practices Survey 2009

## Doctoral Universities Accountability Peer Group Responses

Number of responses from peer group: 7

### Structure of and Resources for General Education Assessment

- 1) Which offices and/or groups are responsible for the following aspects of assessing general education competencies at your institution? (Choose all that apply)

Peer Group	Selecting Assessment Methods	Developing Assessment Instruments	Collecting & Analyzing Data	Reviewing Assessment Findings	Other Assessment Work
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)	2 (28.57%)	5 (71.43%)	3 (42.86%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	3 (42.86%)	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)	3 (42.86%)	3 (42.86%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	3 (42.86%)	2 (28.57%)	4 (57.14%)	5 (71.43%)	4 (57.14%)
Office of Institutional Research	2 (28.57%)	2 (28.57%)	4 (57.14%)	3 (42.86%)	4 (57.14%)
General education assessment committee	6 (85.71%)	4 (57.14%)	3 (42.86%)	6 (85.71%)	2 (28.57%)
Faculty members	4 (57.14%)	5 (71.43%)	4 (57.14%)	6 (85.71%)	1 (14.29%)
Deans/Division Chairs/Dept. Chairs	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)

All Two-Year Institutions (62)	Selecting Assessment Methods	Developing Assessment Instruments	Collecting & Analyzing Data	Reviewing Assessment Findings	Other Assessment Work
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	32 (51.61%)	19 (30.65%)	19 (30.65%)	49 (79.03%)	18 (29.03%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	3 (4.84%)	2 (3.23%)	2 (3.23%)	6 (9.68%)	1 (1.61%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	18 (29.03%)	21 (33.87%)	29 (46.77%)	29 (46.77%)	17 (27.42%)
Office of Institutional Research	17 (27.42%)	23 (37.1%)	37 (59.68%)	29 (46.77%)	23 (37.1%)
General education assessment committee	25 (40.32%)	23 (37.1%)	27 (43.55%)	30 (48.39%)	12 (19.35%)
Faculty members	47 (75.81%)	52 (83.87%)	39 (62.9%)	44 (70.97%)	16 (25.81%)
Deans/Division Chairs/Dept. Chairs	8 (12.9%)	6 (9.68%)	8 (12.9%)	6 (9.68%)	3 (4.84%)

All Four-Year Institutions (33)	Selecting Assessment Methods	Developing Assessment Instruments	Collecting & Analyzing Data	Reviewing Assessment Findings	Other Assessment Work
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	13 (39.39%)	9 (27.27%)	7 (21.21%)	23 (69.7%)	12 (36.36%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	8 (24.24%)	6 (18.18%)	5 (15.15%)	10 (30.3%)	7 (21.21%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	14 (42.42%)	14 (42.42%)	20 (60.61%)	22 (66.67%)	14 (42.42%)
Office of Institutional Research	7 (21.21%)	12 (36.36%)	19 (57.58%)	11 (33.33%)	13 (39.39%)
General education assessment committee	17 (51.52%)	15 (45.45%)	14 (42.42%)	21 (63.64%)	10 (30.3%)
Faculty members	23 (69.7%)	27 (81.82%)	24 (72.73%)	24 (72.73%)	12 (36.36%)
Deans/Division Chairs/Dept. Chairs	1 (3.03%)	1 (3.03%)	2 (6.06%)	4 (12.12%)	2 (6.06%)

2) Please briefly describe the process through which your institution assesses general education competencies.

See attached list of responses

3) Does your institution have one or more staff positions whose primary focus is learning assessment?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	3 (42.86%)	21 (33.87%)	26 (78.79%)
No	4 (57.14%)	41 (66.13%)	7 (21.21%)

3a) (If yes) In what office or offices is this position or positions located? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (21)	Four-Year Institutions (26)
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	1 (25%)	9 (42.86%)	12 (46.15%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	3 (11.54%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	4 (100%)	10 (47.62%)	17 (65.38%)
Office of Institutional Research	2 (50%)	7 (33.33%)	10 (38.46%)
Academic colleges or departments	1 (25%)	1 (4.76%)	5 (19.23%)

4) What resources are available at your institution to support assessment of general education competencies? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Assessment training for faculty or staff as part of formal professional development activities (e.g. in-service sessions, orientation for new faculty)	4 (57.14%)	44 (70.97%)	19 (57.58%)
Optional assessment workshops for faculty or staff	6 (85.71%)	40 (64.52%)	26 (78.79%)
One-on-one consultation with faculty	7 (100%)	44 (70.97%)	30 (90.91%)
Funding for faculty or staff to attend assessment conferences or training	6 (85.71%)	53 (85.48%)	27 (81.82%)
Funding or release time for faculty or staff to work on assessment	2 (28.57%)	22 (35.48%)	9 (27.27%)
Books/reference materials on assessment distributed to faculty or staff	5 (71.43%)	44 (70.97%)	23 (69.7%)

5) Does your institution use centralized software for assessment data collection and reporting?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	5 (71.43%)	23 (37.1%)	22 (66.67%)
No	1 (14.29%)	23 (37.1%)	7 (21.21%)
In Process	1 (14.29%)	16 (25.81%)	4 (12.12%)

5a) (If yes or in process) Which software package do you use or plan to use? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (39)	Four-Year Institutions (26)
Blackboard	1 (16.67%)	6 (15.38%)	7 (26.92%)
Datatel	0 (0%)	3 (7.69%)	1 (3.85%)
Strategic Planning Online (SPOL)	0 (0%)	8 (20.51%)	1 (3.85%)
Task Stream	1 (16.67%)	2 (5.13%)	4 (15.38%)
Tk20	0 (0%)	1 (2.56%)	1 (3.85%)
TracDat	0 (0%)	5 (12.82%)	5 (19.23%)
Weave Online	4 (66.67%)	8 (20.51%)	8 (30.77%)
Locally-developed software	1 (16.67%)	9 (23.08%)	5 (19.23%)
OATS	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (7.69%)
Banner	0 (0%)	1 (2.08%)	1 (3.85%)
Other	1 (16.67%)	7 (14.58%)	3 (11.54%)

5b) (If yes or in process) How long have you been using this software package?

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (39)	Four-Year Institutions (26)
In process of adopting	1 (16.67%)	8 (20.51%)	3 (11.54%)
Less than 1 year	1 (16.67%)	8 (20.51%)	9 (34.62%)
Between 1 and 3 years	0 (0%)	5 (12.82%)	3 (11.54%)
3 years	2 (33.33%)	5 (12.82%)	6 (23.08%)
4 or more years	2 (33.33%)	3 (7.69%)	4 (15.38%)
Use multiple programs	0 (0%)	5 (12.82%)	1 (3.85%)

**General Education Assessment Practices**

6) What is the cycle on which your institution assesses all general education competencies and reviews the assessment findings (recognizing that specific competencies may be assessed on a more frequent schedule)?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Every semester	1 (14.29%)	9 (14.52%)	3 (9.09%)
Every year	3 (42.86%)	25 (40.32%)	12 (36.36%)
Every two years	1 (14.29%)	6 (9.68%)	4 (12.12%)
Every 2-3 years	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.06%)
Every three years or beyond	1 (14.29%)	18 (29.03%)	7 (21.21%)
In process of determining	0 (0%)	2 (3.23%)	3 (9.09%)

7) Does your institution use general knowledge and skills exams to assess general education competencies (e.g. CAAP, CLA, MAPP)?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	6 (85.71%)	17 (27.42%)	29 (87.88%)
No	0 (0%)	41 (66.13%)	1 (3.03%)
In Process	1 (14.29%)	4 (6.45%)	3 (9.09%)

7a) (If yes) Which standardized exam(s) is/are used to measure general education competencies at your institution? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (21)	Four-Year Institutions (32)
CAAP	2 (28.57%)	9 (42.86%)	7 (21.88%)
CBASE	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.13%)
CCTST	0 (0%)	1 (4.76%)	1 (3.13%)
CLA	1 (14.29%)	2 (9.52%)	15 (46.88%)
MAPP	3 (42.86%)	7 (33.33%)	11 (34.38%)
WorkKeys	0 (0%)	2 (9.52%)	0 (0%)
Institutionally-developed exam	1 (14.29%)	2 (9.52%)	3 (9.38%)
NSF Critical Thinking Assessment	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.13%)

7b) (If yes) Which students at your institution take the general knowledge and skills exam(s)? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (21)	Four-Year Institutions (32)
All students completing general education and/or core curriculum (e.g. rising junior exam)	0 (0%)	3 (14.29%)	1 (3.13%)
All graduating students	0 (0%)	1 (4.76%)	1 (3.13%)
A sample of students completing general education and/or core curriculum	2 (28.57%)	11 (52.38%)	5 (15.63%)
A sample of graduating students	1 (14.29%)	4 (19.05%)	4 (12.5%)
A sample of first-year and senior students	4 (57.14%)	2 (9.52%)	23 (71.88%)

8) Which methods of assessing general education competencies are used at your institution and to what extent?

	Institutional Type	Never Used	Used in Past But Not Now	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Course grades in general education and/or core curriculum classes	Peer Group	3 (42.86%)	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)
	Two-Year	16 (25.81%)	12 (19.35%)	2 (3.23%)	11 (17.74%)	21 (33.87%)
	Four-Year	24 (72.73%)	4 (12.12%)	1 (3.03%)	1 (3.03%)	3 (9.09%)
Course grades in more advanced classes that build on general education and/or core curriculum classes	Peer Group	5 (71.43%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	33 (53.23%)	2 (3.23%)	5 (8.06%)	13 (20.97%)	9 (14.52%)
	Four-Year	27 (81.82%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	1 (3.03%)	1 (3.03%)

	Institutional Type	Never Used	Used in Past But Not Now	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Student work from individual course sections (e.g. quizzes, exams, essays, research papers)	Peer Group	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	4 (57.14%)
	Two-Year	1 (1.61%)	1 (1.61%)	5 (8.06%)	13 (20.97%)	42 (67.74%)
	Four-Year	4 (12.12%)	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	4 (12.12%)	20 (60.61%)
Common exams, exam questions, assignments, and/or grading rubrics to assess student work across course sections	Peer Group	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	6 (85.71%)
	Two-Year	3 (4.84%)	0 (0%)	6 (9.68%)	18 (29.03%)	35 (56.45%)
	Four-Year	2 (6.06%)	0 (0%)	4 (12.12%)	7 (21.21%)	20 (60.61%)
Observations of student performance (e.g. simulations, labs, recitals)	Peer Group	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (28.57%)	3 (42.86%)	2 (28.57%)
	Two-Year	6 (9.68%)	0 (0%)	6 (9.68%)	29 (46.77%)	21 (33.87%)
	Four-Year	4 (12.12%)	0 (0%)	7 (21.21%)	13 (39.39%)	9 (27.27%)
Cumulative assessments (e.g. capstone projects, portfolios)	Peer Group	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)	2 (28.57%)	3 (42.86%)	1 (14.29%)
	Two-Year	14 (22.58%)	0 (0%)	10 (16.13%)	21 (33.87%)	17 (27.42%)
	Four-Year	6 (18.18%)	0 (0%)	9 (27.27%)	13 (39.39%)	5 (15.15%)
Student surveys (e.g. NSSE/CCSSE, CIRP surveys, locally-developed surveys)	Peer Group	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)	6 (85.71%)
	Two-Year	7 (11.29%)	2 (3.23%)	4 (6.45%)	18 (29.03%)	31 (50%)
	Four-Year	5 (15.15%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.03%)	6 (18.18%)	21 (63.64%)
Faculty surveys	Peer Group	3 (42.86%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	3 (42.86%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	29 (46.77%)	1 (1.61%)	9 (14.52%)	17 (27.42%)	6 (9.68%)
	Four-Year	19 (57.58%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.03%)	9 (27.27%)	4 (12.12%)
Alumni or graduate surveys	Peer Group	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)	3 (42.86%)
	Two-Year	24 (38.71%)	3 (4.84%)	4 (6.45%)	20 (32.26%)	11 (17.74%)
	Four-Year	7 (21.21%)	3 (9.09%)	5 (15.15%)	7 (21.21%)	11 (33.33%)



	Institutional Type	Never Used	Used in Past But Not Now	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Employer surveys or advisory groups	Peer Group	2 (28.57%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	3 (42.86%)	1 (14.29%)
	Two-Year	19 (30.65%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.61%)	26 (41.94%)	16 (25.81%)
	Four-Year	12 (36.36%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	13 (39.39%)	4 (12.12%)
Student focus groups	Peer Group	3 (42.86%)	0 (0%)	2 (28.57%)	2 (28.57%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	27 (43.55%)	3 (4.84%)	10 (16.13%)	18 (29.03%)	4 (6.45%)
	Four-Year	20 (60.61%)	0 (0%)	7 (21.21%)	6 (18.18%)	0 (0%)
Student success measures (e.g. transfer rates, graduation rates, etc.)	Peer Group	2 (28.57%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	2 (28.57%)	2 (28.57%)
	Two-Year	13 (20.97%)	0 (0%)	3 (4.84%)	9 (14.52%)	37 (59.68%)
	Four-Year	17 (51.52%)	0 (0%)	3 (9.09%)	6 (18.18%)	7 (21.21%)
Data on student performance after transfer or graduation	Peer Group	3 (42.86%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)
	Two-Year	14 (22.58%)	0 (0%)	8 (12.9%)	27 (43.55%)	13 (20.97%)
	Four-Year	20 (60.61%)	0 (0%)	5 (15.15%)	5 (15.15%)	3 (9.09%)

9) What strategies are used to involve students in the general education assessment process at your institution? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Course-embedded assessments	7 (100%)	61 (98.39%)	28 (84.85%)
In-class administration of a standardized exam	4 (57.14%)	35 (56.45%)	17 (51.52%)
Participation in assessment is required outside of class	0 (0%)	8 (12.9%)	8 (24.24%)
Educational/outreach efforts (e.g. explaining the importance of assessment)	2 (28.57%)	14 (22.58%)	11 (33.33%)
Monetary incentives	1 (14.29%)	6 (9.68%)	16 (48.48%)
Non-monetary rewards (e.g. event tickets, prize drawings, etc.)	1 (14.29%)	5 (8.06%)	12 (36.36%)

9a) Which of these strategies (if any) do you find to be most effective?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Course-embedded and in-class assessments	7 (100%)	44 (70.97%)	24 (72.73%)
External rewards (monetary or non-monetary)	1 (14.29%)	1 (1.61%)	9 (27.27%)
Required participation	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.06%)
Educational/outreach efforts	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)	3 (9.09%)
Academic incentives (e.g. bonus points)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.06%)

10) Which of the following options would be most helpful in improving general education assessment practices at your institution? (Choose 3)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
More faculty involvement	3 (42.86%)	28 (45.16%)	18 (54.55%)
More student involvement	0 (0%)	8 (12.9%)	5 (15.15%)
Emphasis on assessment by institutional leaders	3 (42.86%)	9 (14.52%)	10 (30.3%)
Including student learning in the institutional strategic plan	0 (0%)	5 (8.06%)	3 (9.09%)
Additional faculty or staff expertise in assessment methods	4 (57.14%)	33 (53.23%)	18 (54.55%)
Better ways to measure student learning outcomes	2 (28.57%)	23 (37.1%)	10 (30.3%)
Additional resources (e.g. staff, funding)	5 (71.43%)	28 (45.16%)	13 (39.39%)
Information about practices and policies at peer institutions	2 (28.57%)	15 (24.19%)	9 (27.27%)
Agreement on general education/core curriculum learning outcomes throughout the state	1 (14.29%)	26 (41.94%)	9 (27.27%)

11) Please describe one or two practices used by your institution to assess general education competencies that you consider to be working well.

See attached list of responses

12) Please describe one or two significant challenges that your institution faces in assessing general education competencies.

See attached list of responses

**Use of General Education Assessment Findings**

13) With whom and how frequently are institutional-level reports on general education assessment findings shared?

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to	Occasionally	Frequently
Academic administrators	Peer Group	0 (0%)	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)	4 (57.14%)
	Two-Year	3 (4.84%)	7 (11.29%)	16 (25.81%)	35 (56.45%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	9 (27.27%)	19 (57.58%)
Faculty	Peer Group	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	3 (42.86%)	3 (42.86%)
	Two-Year	2 (3.23%)	7 (11.29%)	24 (38.71%)	28 (45.16%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	15 (45.45%)	13 (39.39%)
Staff	Peer Group	4 (57.14%)	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	24 (38.71%)	10 (16.13%)	21 (33.87%)	6 (9.68%)
	Four-Year	14 (42.42%)	7 (21.21%)	9 (27.27%)	3 (9.09%)
Students	Peer Group	3 (42.86%)	3 (42.86%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)
	Two-Year	26 (41.94%)	18 (29.03%)	17 (27.42%)	0 (0%)
	Four-Year	17 (51.52%)	9 (27.27%)	4 (12.12%)	3 (9.09%)
Governing boards	Peer Group	2 (28.57%)	0 (0%)	4 (57.14%)	1 (14.29%)
	Two-Year	14 (22.58%)	12 (19.35%)	26 (41.94%)	9 (14.52%)
	Four-Year	12 (36.36%)	4 (12.12%)	12 (36.36%)	5 (15.15%)
Accreditors (specialized or SACS)	Peer Group	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	3 (42.86%)	3 (42.86%)
	Two-Year	4 (6.45%)	7 (11.29%)	36 (58.06%)	14 (22.58%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	6 (18.18%)	12 (36.36%)	14 (42.42%)
Government regulatory bodies (state or federal)	Peer Group	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	3 (42.86%)	3 (42.86%)
	Two-Year	11 (17.74%)	8 (12.9%)	25 (40.32%)	17 (27.42%)
	Four-Year	5 (15.15%)	6 (18.18%)	11 (33.33%)	11 (33.33%)

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to	Occasionally	Frequently
Alumni	Peer Group	5 (71.43%)	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	44 (70.97%)	11 (17.74%)	6 (9.68%)	0 (0%)
	Four-Year	23 (69.7%)	7 (21.21%)	3 (9.09%)	0 (0%)
General public	Peer Group	4 (57.14%)	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	33 (53.23%)	13 (20.97%)	13 (20.97%)	2 (3.23%)
	Four-Year	21 (63.64%)	6 (18.18%)	5 (15.15%)	1 (3.03%)

14) Who makes decisions about changes to general education and/or the core curriculum based on assessment findings?  
(Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	4 (57.14%)	46 (74.19%)	20 (60.61%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	3 (42.86%)	4 (6.45%)	8 (24.24%)
Academic affairs committee	1 (14.29%)	24 (38.71%)	6 (18.18%)
General education/core curriculum committee	7 (100%)	43 (69.35%)	27 (81.82%)
Deans of individual colleges	6 (85.71%)	11 (17.74%)	16 (48.48%)
Department chairs or departmental undergraduate studies committees	6 (85.71%)	31 (50%)	17 (51.52%)
Faculty members	4 (57.14%)	39 (62.9%)	19 (57.58%)

15) To what extent has your institution used general education competencies assessment findings for each of the following?

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Prepare for institutional accreditation	Peer Group	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)	5 (71.43%)
	Two-Year	2 (3.23%)	6 (9.68%)	16 (25.81%)	38 (61.29%)
	Four-Year	2 (6.06%)	4 (12.12%)	4 (12.12%)	23 (69.7%)
Prepare for specialized accreditation	Peer Group	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	3 (42.86%)	3 (42.86%)
	Two-Year	16 (25.81%)	3 (4.84%)	21 (33.87%)	22 (35.48%)
	Four-Year	7 (21.21%)	5 (15.15%)	10 (30.3%)	11 (33.33%)

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Provide data for public accountability (e.g. VSA)	Peer Group	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	5 (71.43%)
	Two-Year	33 (53.23%)	9 (14.52%)	17 (27.42%)	3 (4.84%)
	Four-Year	5 (15.15%)	3 (9.09%)	5 (15.15%)	20 (60.61%)
Respond to assessment requirements set by THECB and/or governing board	Peer Group	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)	5 (71.43%)
	Two-Year	2 (3.23%)	6 (9.68%)	22 (35.48%)	32 (51.61%)
	Four-Year	2 (6.06%)	6 (18.18%)	7 (21.21%)	18 (54.55%)
Revise general education competencies	Peer Group	0 (0%)	2 (28.57%)	2 (28.57%)	3 (42.86%)
	Two-Year	5 (8.06%)	12 (19.35%)	29 (46.77%)	16 (25.81%)
	Four-Year	4 (12.12%)	13 (39.39%)	9 (27.27%)	7 (21.21%)
Make changes to general education/core curriculum	Peer Group	0 (0%)	2 (28.57%)	2 (28.57%)	3 (42.86%)
	Two-Year	4 (6.45%)	15 (24.19%)	24 (38.71%)	19 (30.65%)
	Four-Year	3 (9.09%)	13 (39.39%)	8 (24.24%)	9 (27.27%)
Refine assessment process and/or measures	Peer Group	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (28.57%)	5 (71.43%)
	Two-Year	5 (8.06%)	16 (25.81%)	16 (25.81%)	25 (40.32%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	11 (33.33%)	17 (51.52%)
Determine student readiness for upper-level coursework	Peer Group	3 (42.86%)	1 (14.29%)	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)
	Two-Year	21 (33.87%)	16 (25.81%)	12 (19.35%)	13 (20.97%)
	Four-Year	18 (54.55%)	9 (27.27%)	4 (12.12%)	2 (6.06%)
Align curricula and/or learning outcomes with K-12 and/or feeder colleges/universities	Peer Group	2 (28.57%)	2 (28.57%)	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)
	Two-Year	13 (20.97%)	27 (43.55%)	17 (27.42%)	5 (8.06%)
	Four-Year	16 (48.48%)	8 (24.24%)	5 (15.15%)	4 (12.12%)

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Align curricula and/or learning outcomes between general education and major sequence courses	Peer Group	2 (28.57%)	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)	2 (28.57%)
	Two-Year	20 (32.26%)	19 (30.65%)	14 (22.58%)	9 (14.52%)
	Four-Year	12 (36.36%)	11 (33.33%)	6 (18.18%)	4 (12.12%)
Improve teaching (e.g. faculty development programs)	Peer Group	0 (0%)	2 (28.57%)	2 (28.57%)	3 (42.86%)
	Two-Year	3 (4.84%)	15 (24.19%)	19 (30.65%)	25 (40.32%)
	Four-Year	10 (30.3%)	7 (21.21%)	11 (33.33%)	5 (15.15%)
Make decisions about faculty tenure, promotion, or merit raises	Peer Group	5 (71.43%)	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	53 (85.48%)	4 (6.45%)	4 (6.45%)	1 (1.61%)
	Four-Year	29 (87.88%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	0 (0%)
Allocate resources to departments	Peer Group	4 (57.14%)	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)
	Two-Year	41 (66.13%)	10 (16.13%)	9 (14.52%)	2 (3.23%)
	Four-Year	26 (78.79%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	3 (9.09%)
Recruit prospective students	Peer Group	6 (85.71%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	53 (85.48%)	4 (6.45%)	5 (8.06%)	0 (0%)
	Four-Year	27 (81.82%)	4 (12.12%)	2 (6.06%)	0 (0%)
Make decisions related to strategic planning	Peer Group	1 (14.29%)	2 (28.57%)	3 (42.86%)	1 (14.29%)
	Two-Year	6 (9.68%)	14 (22.58%)	25 (40.32%)	17 (27.42%)
	Four-Year	11 (33.33%)	9 (27.27%)	8 (24.24%)	5 (15.15%)

16) Has your institution made any recent changes to general education and/or the core curriculum as a result of the assessment process?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	1 (14.29%)	24 (38.71%)	11 (33.33%)
No	3 (42.86%)	21 (33.87%)	13 (39.39%)
In Process	3 (42.86%)	15 (24.19%)	9 (27.27%)

16a) (If yes or in process) Please briefly describe the changes to general education and/or the core curriculum and the reasons for making them.

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (39)	Four-Year Institutions (20)
Defined new general education competencies	0 (0%)	1 (2.56%)	5 (25%)
Mapped general education competencies to curriculum	1 (25%)	3 (7.69%)	2 (10%)
Reduced number of hours in core curriculum	0 (0%)	2 (5.13%)	2 (10%)
Added/dropped general education requirements	0 (0%)	6 (15.38%)	2 (10%)
Dropped excess general education courses/streamlined core	0 (0%)	4 (10.26%)	1 (5%)
Added/dropped courses based on coverage of general education competencies	2 (50%)	5 (12.82%)	5 (25%)
Changed general education course content	2 (50%)	6 (15.38%)	7 (35%)
Changed general education assessment plan	0 (0%)	7 (17.95%)	5 (25%)



# General Education Assessment Practices Survey 2009

## Comprehensive Universities Accountability Peer Group Responses

Number of responses from peer group: 6

### Structure of and Resources for General Education Assessment

1) Which offices and/or groups are responsible for the following aspects of assessing general education competencies at your institution? (Choose all that apply)

Peer Group	Selecting Assessment Methods	Developing Assessment Instruments	Collecting & Analyzing Data	Reviewing Assessment Findings	Other Assessment Work
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	2 (33.33%)	1 (16.67%)	1 (16.67%)	4 (66.67%)	2 (33.33%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (33.33%)	0 (0%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	2 (33.33%)	2 (33.33%)	3 (50%)	4 (66.67%)	3 (50%)
Office of Institutional Research	0 (0%)	1 (16.67%)	2 (33.33%)	1 (16.67%)	1 (16.67%)
General education assessment committee	2 (33.33%)	2 (33.33%)	2 (33.33%)	4 (66.67%)	1 (16.67%)
Faculty members	5 (83.33%)	6 (100%)	4 (66.67%)	4 (66.67%)	3 (50%)
Deans/Division Chairs/Dept. Chairs	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (16.67%)	1 (16.67%)	0 (0%)

All Two-Year Institutions (62)	Selecting Assessment Methods	Developing Assessment Instruments	Collecting & Analyzing Data	Reviewing Assessment Findings	Other Assessment Work
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	32 (51.61%)	19 (30.65%)	19 (30.65%)	49 (79.03%)	18 (29.03%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	3 (4.84%)	2 (3.23%)	2 (3.23%)	6 (9.68%)	1 (1.61%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	18 (29.03%)	21 (33.87%)	29 (46.77%)	29 (46.77%)	17 (27.42%)
Office of Institutional Research	17 (27.42%)	23 (37.1%)	37 (59.68%)	29 (46.77%)	23 (37.1%)
General education assessment committee	25 (40.32%)	23 (37.1%)	27 (43.55%)	30 (48.39%)	12 (19.35%)
Faculty members	47 (75.81%)	52 (83.87%)	39 (62.9%)	44 (70.97%)	16 (25.81%)
Deans/Division Chairs/Dept. Chairs	8 (12.9%)	6 (9.68%)	8 (12.9%)	6 (9.68%)	3 (4.84%)

All Four-Year Institutions (33)	Selecting Assessment Methods	Developing Assessment Instruments	Collecting & Analyzing Data	Reviewing Assessment Findings	Other Assessment Work
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	13 (39.39%)	9 (27.27%)	7 (21.21%)	23 (69.7%)	12 (36.36%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	8 (24.24%)	6 (18.18%)	5 (15.15%)	10 (30.3%)	7 (21.21%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	14 (42.42%)	14 (42.42%)	20 (60.61%)	22 (66.67%)	14 (42.42%)
Office of Institutional Research	7 (21.21%)	12 (36.36%)	19 (57.58%)	11 (33.33%)	13 (39.39%)
General education assessment committee	17 (51.52%)	15 (45.45%)	14 (42.42%)	21 (63.64%)	10 (30.3%)
Faculty members	23 (69.7%)	27 (81.82%)	24 (72.73%)	24 (72.73%)	12 (36.36%)
Deans/Division Chairs/Dept. Chairs	1 (3.03%)	1 (3.03%)	2 (6.06%)	4 (12.12%)	2 (6.06%)

2) Please briefly describe the process through which your institution assesses general education competencies.

See attached list of responses

3) Does your institution have one or more staff positions whose primary focus is learning assessment?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	6 (100%)	21 (33.87%)	26 (78.79%)
No	0 (0%)	41 (66.13%)	7 (21.21%)

3a) (If yes) In what office or offices is this position or positions located? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (21)	Four-Year Institutions (26)
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	3 (50%)	9 (42.86%)	12 (46.15%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	1 (16.67%)	0 (0%)	3 (11.54%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	4 (66.67%)	10 (47.62%)	17 (65.38%)
Office of Institutional Research	1 (16.67%)	7 (33.33%)	10 (38.46%)
Academic colleges or departments	0 (0%)	1 (4.76%)	5 (19.23%)

4) What resources are available at your institution to support assessment of general education competencies? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Assessment training for faculty or staff as part of formal professional development activities (e.g. in-service sessions, orientation for new faculty)	4 (66.67%)	44 (70.97%)	19 (57.58%)
Optional assessment workshops for faculty or staff	6 (100%)	40 (64.52%)	26 (78.79%)
One-on-one consultation with faculty	6 (100%)	44 (70.97%)	30 (90.91%)
Funding for faculty or staff to attend assessment conferences or training	5 (83.33%)	53 (85.48%)	27 (81.82%)
Funding or release time for faculty or staff to work on assessment	3 (50%)	22 (35.48%)	9 (27.27%)
Books/reference materials on assessment distributed to faculty or staff	5 (83.33%)	44 (70.97%)	23 (69.7%)

5) Does your institution use centralized software for assessment data collection and reporting?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	4 (66.67%)	23 (37.1%)	22 (66.67%)
No	2 (33.33%)	23 (37.1%)	7 (21.21%)
In Process	0 (0%)	16 (25.81%)	4 (12.12%)

5a) (If yes or in process) Which software package do you use or plan to use? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (39)	Four-Year Institutions (26)
Blackboard	1 (25%)	6 (15.38%)	7 (26.92%)
Datatel	0 (0%)	3 (7.69%)	1 (3.85%)
Strategic Planning Online (SPOL)	0 (0%)	8 (20.51%)	1 (3.85%)
Task Stream	0 (0%)	2 (5.13%)	4 (15.38%)
Tk20	0 (0%)	1 (2.56%)	1 (3.85%)
TracDat	2 (50%)	5 (12.82%)	5 (19.23%)
Weave Online	2 (50%)	8 (20.51%)	8 (30.77%)
Locally-developed software	0 (0%)	9 (23.08%)	5 (19.23%)
OATS	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (7.69%)
Banner	0 (0%)	1 (2.08%)	1 (3.85%)
Other	0 (0%)	7 (14.58%)	3 (11.54%)

5b) (If yes or in process) How long have you been using this software package?

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (39)	Four-Year Institutions (26)
In process of adopting	1 (25%)	8 (20.51%)	3 (11.54%)
Less than 1 year	2 (50%)	8 (20.51%)	9 (34.62%)
Between 1 and 3 years	0 (0%)	5 (12.82%)	3 (11.54%)
3 years	1 (25%)	5 (12.82%)	6 (23.08%)
4 or more years	0 (0%)	3 (7.69%)	4 (15.38%)
Use multiple programs	0 (0%)	5 (12.82%)	1 (3.85%)

**General Education Assessment Practices**

6) What is the cycle on which your institution assesses all general education competencies and reviews the assessment findings (recognizing that specific competencies may be assessed on a more frequent schedule)?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Every semester	1 (16.67%)	9 (14.52%)	3 (9.09%)
Every year	2 (33.33%)	25 (40.32%)	12 (36.36%)
Every two years	1 (16.67%)	6 (9.68%)	4 (12.12%)
Every 2-3 years	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.06%)
Every three years or beyond	2 (33.33%)	18 (29.03%)	7 (21.21%)
In process of determining	0 (0%)	2 (3.23%)	3 (9.09%)

7) Does your institution use general knowledge and skills exams to assess general education competencies (e.g. CAAP, CLA, MAPP)?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	6 (100%)	17 (27.42%)	29 (87.88%)
No	0 (0%)	41 (66.13%)	1 (3.03%)
In Process	0 (0%)	4 (6.45%)	3 (9.09%)

7a) (If yes) Which standardized exam(s) is/are used to measure general education competencies at your institution? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (21)	Four-Year Institutions (32)
CAAP	1 (16.67%)	9 (42.86%)	7 (21.88%)
CBASE	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.13%)
CCTST	1 (16.67%)	1 (4.76%)	1 (3.13%)
CLA	3 (50%)	2 (9.52%)	15 (46.88%)
MAPP	2 (33.33%)	7 (33.33%)	11 (34.38%)
WorkKeys	0 (0%)	2 (9.52%)	0 (0%)
Institutionally-developed exam	0 (0%)	2 (9.52%)	3 (9.38%)
NSF Critical Thinking Assessment	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.13%)

7b) (If yes) Which students at your institution take the general knowledge and skills exam(s)? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (21)	Four-Year Institutions (32)
All students completing general education and/or core curriculum (e.g. rising junior exam)	0 (0%)	3 (14.29%)	1 (3.13%)
All graduating students	0 (0%)	1 (4.76%)	1 (3.13%)
A sample of students completing general education and/or core curriculum	1 (16.67%)	11 (52.38%)	5 (15.63%)
A sample of graduating students	0 (0%)	4 (19.05%)	4 (12.5%)
A sample of first-year and senior students	6 (100%)	2 (9.52%)	23 (71.88%)

8) Which methods of assessing general education competencies are used at your institution and to what extent?

	Institutional Type	Never Used	Used in Past But Not Now	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Course grades in general education and/or core curriculum classes	Peer Group	4 (66.67%)	1 (16.67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (16.67%)
	Two-Year	16 (25.81%)	12 (19.35%)	2 (3.23%)	11 (17.74%)	21 (33.87%)
	Four-Year	24 (72.73%)	4 (12.12%)	1 (3.03%)	1 (3.03%)	3 (9.09%)
Course grades in more advanced classes that build on general education and/or core curriculum classes	Peer Group	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	33 (53.23%)	2 (3.23%)	5 (8.06%)	13 (20.97%)	9 (14.52%)
	Four-Year	27 (81.82%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	1 (3.03%)	1 (3.03%)

	Institutional Type	Never Used	Used in Past But Not Now	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Student work from individual course sections (e.g. quizzes, exams, essays, research papers)	Peer Group	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (100%)
	Two-Year	1 (1.61%)	1 (1.61%)	5 (8.06%)	13 (20.97%)	42 (67.74%)
	Four-Year	4 (12.12%)	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	4 (12.12%)	20 (60.61%)
Common exams, exam questions, assignments, and/or grading rubrics to assess student work across course sections	Peer Group	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (100%)
	Two-Year	3 (4.84%)	0 (0%)	6 (9.68%)	18 (29.03%)	35 (56.45%)
	Four-Year	2 (6.06%)	0 (0%)	4 (12.12%)	7 (21.21%)	20 (60.61%)
Observations of student performance (e.g. simulations, labs, recitals)	Peer Group	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (33.33%)	4 (66.67%)
	Two-Year	6 (9.68%)	0 (0%)	6 (9.68%)	29 (46.77%)	21 (33.87%)
	Four-Year	4 (12.12%)	0 (0%)	7 (21.21%)	13 (39.39%)	9 (27.27%)
Cumulative assessments (e.g. capstone projects, portfolios)	Peer Group	2 (33.33%)	0 (0%)	1 (16.67%)	2 (33.33%)	1 (16.67%)
	Two-Year	14 (22.58%)	0 (0%)	10 (16.13%)	21 (33.87%)	17 (27.42%)
	Four-Year	6 (18.18%)	0 (0%)	9 (27.27%)	13 (39.39%)	5 (15.15%)
Student surveys (e.g. NSSE/CCSSE, CIRP surveys, locally-developed surveys)	Peer Group	2 (33.33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (66.67%)
	Two-Year	7 (11.29%)	2 (3.23%)	4 (6.45%)	18 (29.03%)	31 (50%)
	Four-Year	5 (15.15%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.03%)	6 (18.18%)	21 (63.64%)
Faculty surveys	Peer Group	3 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (33.33%)	1 (16.67%)
	Two-Year	29 (46.77%)	1 (1.61%)	9 (14.52%)	17 (27.42%)	6 (9.68%)
	Four-Year	19 (57.58%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.03%)	9 (27.27%)	4 (12.12%)
Alumni or graduate surveys	Peer Group	2 (33.33%)	2 (33.33%)	0 (0%)	1 (16.67%)	1 (16.67%)
	Two-Year	24 (38.71%)	3 (4.84%)	4 (6.45%)	20 (32.26%)	11 (17.74%)
	Four-Year	7 (21.21%)	3 (9.09%)	5 (15.15%)	7 (21.21%)	11 (33.33%)



	Institutional Type	Never Used	Used in Past But Not Now	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Employer surveys or advisory groups	Peer Group	3 (50%)	1 (16.67%)	0 (0%)	1 (16.67%)	1 (16.67%)
	Two-Year	19 (30.65%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.61%)	26 (41.94%)	16 (25.81%)
	Four-Year	12 (36.36%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	13 (39.39%)	4 (12.12%)
Student focus groups	Peer Group	5 (83.33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (16.67%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	27 (43.55%)	3 (4.84%)	10 (16.13%)	18 (29.03%)	4 (6.45%)
	Four-Year	20 (60.61%)	0 (0%)	7 (21.21%)	6 (18.18%)	0 (0%)
Student success measures (e.g. transfer rates, graduation rates, etc.)	Peer Group	4 (66.67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (33.33%)
	Two-Year	13 (20.97%)	0 (0%)	3 (4.84%)	9 (14.52%)	37 (59.68%)
	Four-Year	17 (51.52%)	0 (0%)	3 (9.09%)	6 (18.18%)	7 (21.21%)
Data on student performance after transfer or graduation	Peer Group	5 (83.33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (16.67%)
	Two-Year	14 (22.58%)	0 (0%)	8 (12.9%)	27 (43.55%)	13 (20.97%)
	Four-Year	20 (60.61%)	0 (0%)	5 (15.15%)	5 (15.15%)	3 (9.09%)

9) What strategies are used to involve students in the general education assessment process at your institution? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Course-embedded assessments	6 (100%)	61 (98.39%)	28 (84.85%)
In-class administration of a standardized exam	4 (66.67%)	35 (56.45%)	17 (51.52%)
Participation in assessment is required outside of class	3 (50%)	8 (12.9%)	8 (24.24%)
Educational/outreach efforts (e.g. explaining the importance of assessment)	2 (33.33%)	14 (22.58%)	11 (33.33%)
Monetary incentives	2 (33.33%)	6 (9.68%)	16 (48.48%)
Non-monetary rewards (e.g. event tickets, prize drawings, etc.)	3 (50%)	5 (8.06%)	12 (36.36%)

9a) Which of these strategies (if any) do you find to be most effective?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Course-embedded and in-class assessments	4 (66.67%)	44 (70.97%)	24 (72.73%)
External rewards (monetary or non-monetary)	1 (16.67%)	1 (1.61%)	9 (27.27%)
Required participation	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.06%)
Educational/outreach efforts	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (9.09%)
Academic incentives (e.g. bonus points)	1 (16.67%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.06%)

10) Which of the following options would be most helpful in improving general education assessment practices at your institution? (Choose 3)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
More faculty involvement	3 (50%)	28 (45.16%)	18 (54.55%)
More student involvement	2 (33.33%)	8 (12.9%)	5 (15.15%)
Emphasis on assessment by institutional leaders	1 (16.67%)	9 (14.52%)	10 (30.3%)
Including student learning in the institutional strategic plan	2 (33.33%)	5 (8.06%)	3 (9.09%)
Additional faculty or staff expertise in assessment methods	2 (33.33%)	33 (53.23%)	18 (54.55%)
Better ways to measure student learning outcomes	3 (50%)	23 (37.1%)	10 (30.3%)
Additional resources (e.g. staff, funding)	1 (16.67%)	28 (45.16%)	13 (39.39%)
Information about practices and policies at peer institutions	0 (0%)	15 (24.19%)	9 (27.27%)
Agreement on general education/core curriculum learning outcomes throughout the state	4 (66.67%)	26 (41.94%)	9 (27.27%)

11) Please describe one or two practices used by your institution to assess general education competencies that you consider to be working well.

See attached list of responses

12) Please describe one or two significant challenges that your institution faces in assessing general education competencies.

See attached list of responses

**Use of General Education Assessment Findings**

13) With whom and how frequently are institutional-level reports on general education assessment findings shared?

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to	Occasionally	Frequently
Academic administrators	Peer Group	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (16.67%)	5 (83.33%)
	Two-Year	3 (4.84%)	7 (11.29%)	16 (25.81%)	35 (56.45%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	9 (27.27%)	19 (57.58%)
Faculty	Peer Group	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (33.33%)	4 (66.67%)
	Two-Year	2 (3.23%)	7 (11.29%)	24 (38.71%)	28 (45.16%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	15 (45.45%)	13 (39.39%)
Staff	Peer Group	4 (66.67%)	1 (16.67%)	1 (16.67%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	24 (38.71%)	10 (16.13%)	21 (33.87%)	6 (9.68%)
	Four-Year	14 (42.42%)	7 (21.21%)	9 (27.27%)	3 (9.09%)
Students	Peer Group	3 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (33.33%)	1 (16.67%)
	Two-Year	26 (41.94%)	18 (29.03%)	17 (27.42%)	0 (0%)
	Four-Year	17 (51.52%)	9 (27.27%)	4 (12.12%)	3 (9.09%)
Governing boards	Peer Group	3 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (16.67%)	2 (33.33%)
	Two-Year	14 (22.58%)	12 (19.35%)	26 (41.94%)	9 (14.52%)
	Four-Year	12 (36.36%)	4 (12.12%)	12 (36.36%)	5 (15.15%)
Accreditors (specialized or SACS)	Peer Group	0 (0%)	1 (16.67%)	0 (0%)	5 (83.33%)
	Two-Year	4 (6.45%)	7 (11.29%)	36 (58.06%)	14 (22.58%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	6 (18.18%)	12 (36.36%)	14 (42.42%)
Government regulatory bodies (state or federal)	Peer Group	0 (0%)	1 (16.67%)	2 (33.33%)	3 (50%)
	Two-Year	11 (17.74%)	8 (12.9%)	25 (40.32%)	17 (27.42%)
	Four-Year	5 (15.15%)	6 (18.18%)	11 (33.33%)	11 (33.33%)

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to	Occasionally	Frequently
Alumni	Peer Group	4 (66.67%)	1 (16.67%)	1 (16.67%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	44 (70.97%)	11 (17.74%)	6 (9.68%)	0 (0%)
	Four-Year	23 (69.7%)	7 (21.21%)	3 (9.09%)	0 (0%)
General public	Peer Group	4 (66.67%)	0 (0%)	2 (33.33%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	33 (53.23%)	13 (20.97%)	13 (20.97%)	2 (3.23%)
	Four-Year	21 (63.64%)	6 (18.18%)	5 (15.15%)	1 (3.03%)

14) Who makes decisions about changes to general education and/or the core curriculum based on assessment findings?  
(Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	3 (50%)	46 (74.19%)	20 (60.61%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	0 (0%)	4 (6.45%)	8 (24.24%)
Academic affairs committee	3 (50%)	24 (38.71%)	6 (18.18%)
General education/core curriculum committee	5 (83.33%)	43 (69.35%)	27 (81.82%)
Deans of individual colleges	4 (66.67%)	11 (17.74%)	16 (48.48%)
Department chairs or departmental undergraduate studies committees	4 (66.67%)	31 (50%)	17 (51.52%)
Faculty members	5 (83.33%)	39 (62.9%)	19 (57.58%)

15) To what extent has your institution used general education competencies assessment findings for each of the following?

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Prepare for institutional accreditation	Peer Group	0 (0%)	1 (16.67%)	0 (0%)	5 (83.33%)
	Two-Year	2 (3.23%)	6 (9.68%)	16 (25.81%)	38 (61.29%)
	Four-Year	2 (6.06%)	4 (12.12%)	4 (12.12%)	23 (69.7%)
Prepare for specialized accreditation	Peer Group	1 (16.67%)	1 (16.67%)	0 (0%)	4 (66.67%)
	Two-Year	16 (25.81%)	3 (4.84%)	21 (33.87%)	22 (35.48%)
	Four-Year	7 (21.21%)	5 (15.15%)	10 (30.3%)	11 (33.33%)

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Provide data for public accountability (e.g. VSA)	Peer Group	0 (0%)	2 (33.33%)	0 (0%)	4 (66.67%)
	Two-Year	33 (53.23%)	9 (14.52%)	17 (27.42%)	3 (4.84%)
	Four-Year	5 (15.15%)	3 (9.09%)	5 (15.15%)	20 (60.61%)
Respond to assessment requirements set by THECB and/or governing board	Peer Group	0 (0%)	2 (33.33%)	0 (0%)	4 (66.67%)
	Two-Year	2 (3.23%)	6 (9.68%)	22 (35.48%)	32 (51.61%)
	Four-Year	2 (6.06%)	6 (18.18%)	7 (21.21%)	18 (54.55%)
Revise general education competencies	Peer Group	1 (16.67%)	2 (33.33%)	2 (33.33%)	1 (16.67%)
	Two-Year	5 (8.06%)	12 (19.35%)	29 (46.77%)	16 (25.81%)
	Four-Year	4 (12.12%)	13 (39.39%)	9 (27.27%)	7 (21.21%)
Make changes to general education/core curriculum	Peer Group	1 (16.67%)	2 (33.33%)	0 (0%)	3 (50%)
	Two-Year	4 (6.45%)	15 (24.19%)	24 (38.71%)	19 (30.65%)
	Four-Year	3 (9.09%)	13 (39.39%)	8 (24.24%)	9 (27.27%)
Refine assessment process and/or measures	Peer Group	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (33.33%)	4 (66.67%)
	Two-Year	5 (8.06%)	16 (25.81%)	16 (25.81%)	25 (40.32%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	11 (33.33%)	17 (51.52%)
Determine student readiness for upper-level coursework	Peer Group	4 (66.67%)	1 (16.67%)	1 (16.67%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	21 (33.87%)	16 (25.81%)	12 (19.35%)	13 (20.97%)
	Four-Year	18 (54.55%)	9 (27.27%)	4 (12.12%)	2 (6.06%)
Align curricula and/or learning outcomes with K-12 and/or feeder colleges/universities	Peer Group	2 (33.33%)	1 (16.67%)	1 (16.67%)	2 (33.33%)
	Two-Year	13 (20.97%)	27 (43.55%)	17 (27.42%)	5 (8.06%)
	Four-Year	16 (48.48%)	8 (24.24%)	5 (15.15%)	4 (12.12%)

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Align curricula and/or learning outcomes between general education and major sequence courses	Peer Group	2 (33.33%)	1 (16.67%)	2 (33.33%)	1 (16.67%)
	Two-Year	20 (32.26%)	19 (30.65%)	14 (22.58%)	9 (14.52%)
	Four-Year	12 (36.36%)	11 (33.33%)	6 (18.18%)	4 (12.12%)
Improve teaching (e.g. faculty development programs)	Peer Group	1 (16.67%)	0 (0%)	3 (50%)	2 (33.33%)
	Two-Year	3 (4.84%)	15 (24.19%)	19 (30.65%)	25 (40.32%)
	Four-Year	10 (30.3%)	7 (21.21%)	11 (33.33%)	5 (15.15%)
Make decisions about faculty tenure, promotion, or merit raises	Peer Group	5 (83.33%)	0 (0%)	1 (16.67%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	53 (85.48%)	4 (6.45%)	4 (6.45%)	1 (1.61%)
	Four-Year	29 (87.88%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	0 (0%)
Allocate resources to departments	Peer Group	5 (83.33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (16.67%)
	Two-Year	41 (66.13%)	10 (16.13%)	9 (14.52%)	2 (3.23%)
	Four-Year	26 (78.79%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	3 (9.09%)
Recruit prospective students	Peer Group	5 (83.33%)	0 (0%)	1 (16.67%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	53 (85.48%)	4 (6.45%)	5 (8.06%)	0 (0%)
	Four-Year	27 (81.82%)	4 (12.12%)	2 (6.06%)	0 (0%)
Make decisions related to strategic planning	Peer Group	1 (16.67%)	1 (16.67%)	2 (33.33%)	2 (33.33%)
	Two-Year	6 (9.68%)	14 (22.58%)	25 (40.32%)	17 (27.42%)
	Four-Year	11 (33.33%)	9 (27.27%)	8 (24.24%)	5 (15.15%)

16) Has your institution made any recent changes to general education and/or the core curriculum as a result of the assessment process?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	3 (50%)	24 (38.71%)	11 (33.33%)
No	2 (33.33%)	21 (33.87%)	13 (39.39%)
In Process	1 (16.67%)	15 (24.19%)	9 (27.27%)

16a) (If yes or in process) Please briefly describe the changes to general education and/or the core curriculum and the reasons for making them.

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (39)	Four-Year Institutions (20)
Defined new general education competencies	1 (25%)	1 (2.56%)	5 (25%)
Mapped general education competencies to curriculum	0 (0%)	3 (7.69%)	2 (10%)
Reduced number of hours in core curriculum	1 (25%)	2 (5.13%)	2 (10%)
Added/dropped general education requirements	1 (25%)	6 (15.38%)	2 (10%)
Dropped excess general education courses/streamlined core	0 (0%)	4 (10.26%)	1 (5%)
Added/dropped courses based on coverage of general education competencies	1 (25%)	5 (12.82%)	5 (25%)
Changed general education course content	1 (25%)	6 (15.38%)	7 (35%)
Changed general education assessment plan	1 (25%)	7 (17.95%)	5 (25%)



# General Education Assessment Practices Survey 2009

## Master's Universities Accountability Peer Group Responses

Number of responses from peer group: 11

### Structure of and Resources for General Education Assessment

1) Which offices and/or groups are responsible for the following aspects of assessing general education competencies at your institution? (Choose all that apply)

Peer Group	Selecting Assessment Methods	Developing Assessment Instruments	Collecting & Analyzing Data	Reviewing Assessment Findings	Other Assessment Work
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	4 (36.36%)	2 (18.18%)	1 (9.09%)	8 (72.73%)	4 (36.36%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	2 (18.18%)	1 (9.09%)	1 (9.09%)	1 (9.09%)	2 (18.18%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	4 (36.36%)	3 (27.27%)	6 (54.55%)	7 (63.64%)	3 (27.27%)
Office of Institutional Research	3 (27.27%)	4 (36.36%)	6 (54.55%)	4 (36.36%)	3 (27.27%)
General education assessment committee	4 (36.36%)	4 (36.36%)	4 (36.36%)	6 (54.55%)	3 (27.27%)
Faculty members	6 (54.55%)	7 (63.64%)	7 (63.64%)	8 (72.73%)	5 (45.45%)
Deans/Division Chairs/Dept. Chairs	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (9.09%)	1 (9.09%)

All Two-Year Institutions (62)	Selecting Assessment Methods	Developing Assessment Instruments	Collecting & Analyzing Data	Reviewing Assessment Findings	Other Assessment Work
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	32 (51.61%)	19 (30.65%)	19 (30.65%)	49 (79.03%)	18 (29.03%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	3 (4.84%)	2 (3.23%)	2 (3.23%)	6 (9.68%)	1 (1.61%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	18 (29.03%)	21 (33.87%)	29 (46.77%)	29 (46.77%)	17 (27.42%)
Office of Institutional Research	17 (27.42%)	23 (37.1%)	37 (59.68%)	29 (46.77%)	23 (37.1%)
General education assessment committee	25 (40.32%)	23 (37.1%)	27 (43.55%)	30 (48.39%)	12 (19.35%)
Faculty members	47 (75.81%)	52 (83.87%)	39 (62.9%)	44 (70.97%)	16 (25.81%)
Deans/Division Chairs/Dept. Chairs	8 (12.9%)	6 (9.68%)	8 (12.9%)	6 (9.68%)	3 (4.84%)

All Four-Year Institutions (33)	Selecting Assessment Methods	Developing Assessment Instruments	Collecting & Analyzing Data	Reviewing Assessment Findings	Other Assessment Work
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	13 (39.39%)	9 (27.27%)	7 (21.21%)	23 (69.7%)	12 (36.36%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	8 (24.24%)	6 (18.18%)	5 (15.15%)	10 (30.3%)	7 (21.21%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	14 (42.42%)	14 (42.42%)	20 (60.61%)	22 (66.67%)	14 (42.42%)
Office of Institutional Research	7 (21.21%)	12 (36.36%)	19 (57.58%)	11 (33.33%)	13 (39.39%)
General education assessment committee	17 (51.52%)	15 (45.45%)	14 (42.42%)	21 (63.64%)	10 (30.3%)
Faculty members	23 (69.7%)	27 (81.82%)	24 (72.73%)	24 (72.73%)	12 (36.36%)
Deans/Division Chairs/Dept. Chairs	1 (3.03%)	1 (3.03%)	2 (6.06%)	4 (12.12%)	2 (6.06%)

2) Please briefly describe the process through which your institution assesses general education competencies.

See attached list of responses

3) Does your institution have one or more staff positions whose primary focus is learning assessment?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	7 (63.64%)	21 (33.87%)	26 (78.79%)
No	4 (36.36%)	41 (66.13%)	7 (21.21%)

3a) (If yes) In what office or offices is this position or positions located? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (21)	Four-Year Institutions (26)
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	1 (14.29%)	9 (42.86%)	12 (46.15%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (11.54%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	4 (57.14%)	10 (47.62%)	17 (65.38%)
Office of Institutional Research	3 (42.86%)	7 (33.33%)	10 (38.46%)
Academic colleges or departments	1 (14.29%)	1 (4.76%)	5 (19.23%)

4) What resources are available at your institution to support assessment of general education competencies? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Assessment training for faculty or staff as part of formal professional development activities (e.g. in-service sessions, orientation for new faculty)	6 (54.55%)	44 (70.97%)	19 (57.58%)
Optional assessment workshops for faculty or staff	6 (54.55%)	40 (64.52%)	26 (78.79%)
One-on-one consultation with faculty	8 (72.73%)	44 (70.97%)	30 (90.91%)
Funding for faculty or staff to attend assessment conferences or training	9 (81.82%)	53 (85.48%)	27 (81.82%)
Funding or release time for faculty or staff to work on assessment	2 (18.18%)	22 (35.48%)	9 (27.27%)
Books/reference materials on assessment distributed to faculty or staff	6 (54.55%)	44 (70.97%)	23 (69.7%)

5) Does your institution use centralized software for assessment data collection and reporting?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	6 (54.55%)	23 (37.1%)	22 (66.67%)
No	2 (18.18%)	23 (37.1%)	7 (21.21%)
In Process	3 (27.27%)	16 (25.81%)	4 (12.12%)

5a) (If yes or in process) Which software package do you use or plan to use? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (39)	Four-Year Institutions (26)
Blackboard	4 (44.44%)	6 (15.38%)	7 (26.92%)
Datatel	1 (11.11%)	3 (7.69%)	1 (3.85%)
Strategic Planning Online (SPOL)	1 (11.11%)	8 (20.51%)	1 (3.85%)
Task Stream	3 (33.33%)	2 (5.13%)	4 (15.38%)
Tk20	1 (11.11%)	1 (2.56%)	1 (3.85%)
TracDat	1 (11.11%)	5 (12.82%)	5 (19.23%)
Weave Online	1 (11.11%)	8 (20.51%)	8 (30.77%)
Locally-developed software	3 (33.33%)	9 (23.08%)	5 (19.23%)
OATS	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (7.69%)
Banner	1 (11.11%)	1 (2.08%)	1 (3.85%)
Other	0 (0%)	7 (14.58%)	3 (11.54%)

5b) (If yes or in process) How long have you been using this software package?

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (39)	Four-Year Institutions (26)
In process of adopting	1 (11.11%)	8 (20.51%)	3 (11.54%)
Less than 1 year	3 (33.33%)	8 (20.51%)	9 (34.62%)
Between 1 and 3 years	1 (11.11%)	5 (12.82%)	3 (11.54%)
3 years	2 (22.22%)	5 (12.82%)	6 (23.08%)
4 or more years	1 (11.11%)	3 (7.69%)	4 (15.38%)
Use multiple programs	1 (11.11%)	5 (12.82%)	1 (3.85%)

**General Education Assessment Practices**

6) What is the cycle on which your institution assesses all general education competencies and reviews the assessment findings (recognizing that specific competencies may be assessed on a more frequent schedule)?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Every semester	1 (9.09%)	9 (14.52%)	3 (9.09%)
Every year	1 (9.09%)	25 (40.32%)	12 (36.36%)
Every two years	0 (0%)	6 (9.68%)	4 (12.12%)
Every 2-3 years	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.06%)
Every three years or beyond	4 (36.36%)	18 (29.03%)	7 (21.21%)
In process of determining	3 (27.27%)	2 (3.23%)	3 (9.09%)

7) Does your institution use general knowledge and skills exams to assess general education competencies (e.g. CAAP, CLA, MAPP)?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	8 (72.73%)	17 (27.42%)	29 (87.88%)
No	1 (9.09%)	41 (66.13%)	1 (3.03%)
In Process	2 (18.18%)	4 (6.45%)	3 (9.09%)

7a) (If yes) Which standardized exam(s) is/are used to measure general education competencies at your institution? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (21)	Four-Year Institutions (32)
CAAP	3 (30%)	9 (42.86%)	7 (21.88%)
CBASE	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.13%)
CCTST	0 (0%)	1 (4.76%)	1 (3.13%)
CLA	3 (30%)	2 (9.52%)	15 (46.88%)
MAPP	6 (60%)	7 (33.33%)	11 (34.38%)
WorkKeys	0 (0%)	2 (9.52%)	0 (0%)
Institutionally-developed exam	2 (20%)	2 (9.52%)	3 (9.38%)
NSF Critical Thinking Assessment	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.13%)

7b) (If yes) Which students at your institution take the general knowledge and skills exam(s)? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (21)	Four-Year Institutions (32)
All students completing general education and/or core curriculum (e.g. rising junior exam)	1 (10%)	3 (14.29%)	1 (3.13%)
All graduating students	1 (10%)	1 (4.76%)	1 (3.13%)
A sample of students completing general education and/or core curriculum	2 (20%)	11 (52.38%)	5 (15.63%)
A sample of graduating students	1 (10%)	4 (19.05%)	4 (12.5%)
A sample of first-year and senior students	5 (50%)	2 (9.52%)	23 (71.88%)

8) Which methods of assessing general education competencies are used at your institution and to what extent?

	Institutional Type	Never Used	Used in Past But Not Now	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Course grades in general education and/or core curriculum classes	Peer Group	10 (90.91%)	1 (9.09%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	16 (25.81%)	12 (19.35%)	2 (3.23%)	11 (17.74%)	21 (33.87%)
	Four-Year	24 (72.73%)	4 (12.12%)	1 (3.03%)	1 (3.03%)	3 (9.09%)
Course grades in more advanced classes that build on general education and/or core curriculum classes	Peer Group	7 (63.64%)	1 (9.09%)	2 (18.18%)	0 (0%)	1 (9.09%)
	Two-Year	33 (53.23%)	2 (3.23%)	5 (8.06%)	13 (20.97%)	9 (14.52%)
	Four-Year	27 (81.82%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	1 (3.03%)	1 (3.03%)

	Institutional Type	Never Used	Used in Past But Not Now	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Student work from individual course sections (e.g. quizzes, exams, essays, research papers)	Peer Group	2 (18.18%)	0 (0%)	3 (27.27%)	3 (27.27%)	3 (27.27%)
	Two-Year	1 (1.61%)	1 (1.61%)	5 (8.06%)	13 (20.97%)	42 (67.74%)
	Four-Year	4 (12.12%)	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	4 (12.12%)	20 (60.61%)
Common exams, exam questions, assignments, and/or grading rubrics to assess student work across course sections	Peer Group	1 (9.09%)	0 (0%)	4 (36.36%)	4 (36.36%)	2 (18.18%)
	Two-Year	3 (4.84%)	0 (0%)	6 (9.68%)	18 (29.03%)	35 (56.45%)
	Four-Year	2 (6.06%)	0 (0%)	4 (12.12%)	7 (21.21%)	20 (60.61%)
Observations of student performance (e.g. simulations, labs, recitals)	Peer Group	2 (18.18%)	0 (0%)	3 (27.27%)	5 (45.45%)	1 (9.09%)
	Two-Year	6 (9.68%)	0 (0%)	6 (9.68%)	29 (46.77%)	21 (33.87%)
	Four-Year	4 (12.12%)	0 (0%)	7 (21.21%)	13 (39.39%)	9 (27.27%)
Cumulative assessments (e.g. capstone projects, portfolios)	Peer Group	1 (9.09%)	0 (0%)	4 (36.36%)	5 (45.45%)	1 (9.09%)
	Two-Year	14 (22.58%)	0 (0%)	10 (16.13%)	21 (33.87%)	17 (27.42%)
	Four-Year	6 (18.18%)	0 (0%)	9 (27.27%)	13 (39.39%)	5 (15.15%)
Student surveys (e.g. NSSE/CCSSE, CIRP surveys, locally-developed surveys)	Peer Group	2 (18.18%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (45.45%)	4 (36.36%)
	Two-Year	7 (11.29%)	2 (3.23%)	4 (6.45%)	18 (29.03%)	31 (50%)
	Four-Year	5 (15.15%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.03%)	6 (18.18%)	21 (63.64%)
Faculty surveys	Peer Group	6 (54.55%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (18.18%)	3 (27.27%)
	Two-Year	29 (46.77%)	1 (1.61%)	9 (14.52%)	17 (27.42%)	6 (9.68%)
	Four-Year	19 (57.58%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.03%)	9 (27.27%)	4 (12.12%)
Alumni or graduate surveys	Peer Group	3 (27.27%)	1 (9.09%)	3 (27.27%)	2 (18.18%)	2 (18.18%)
	Two-Year	24 (38.71%)	3 (4.84%)	4 (6.45%)	20 (32.26%)	11 (17.74%)
	Four-Year	7 (21.21%)	3 (9.09%)	5 (15.15%)	7 (21.21%)	11 (33.33%)



	Institutional Type	Never Used	Used in Past But Not Now	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Employer surveys or advisory groups	Peer Group	4 (36.36%)	0 (0%)	1 (9.09%)	5 (45.45%)	1 (9.09%)
	Two-Year	19 (30.65%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.61%)	26 (41.94%)	16 (25.81%)
	Four-Year	12 (36.36%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	13 (39.39%)	4 (12.12%)
Student focus groups	Peer Group	5 (45.45%)	0 (0%)	4 (36.36%)	2 (18.18%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	27 (43.55%)	3 (4.84%)	10 (16.13%)	18 (29.03%)	4 (6.45%)
	Four-Year	20 (60.61%)	0 (0%)	7 (21.21%)	6 (18.18%)	0 (0%)
Student success measures (e.g. transfer rates, graduation rates, etc.)	Peer Group	7 (63.64%)	0 (0%)	2 (18.18%)	1 (9.09%)	1 (9.09%)
	Two-Year	13 (20.97%)	0 (0%)	3 (4.84%)	9 (14.52%)	37 (59.68%)
	Four-Year	17 (51.52%)	0 (0%)	3 (9.09%)	6 (18.18%)	7 (21.21%)
Data on student performance after transfer or graduation	Peer Group	6 (54.55%)	0 (0%)	2 (18.18%)	2 (18.18%)	1 (9.09%)
	Two-Year	14 (22.58%)	0 (0%)	8 (12.9%)	27 (43.55%)	13 (20.97%)
	Four-Year	20 (60.61%)	0 (0%)	5 (15.15%)	5 (15.15%)	3 (9.09%)

9) What strategies are used to involve students in the general education assessment process at your institution? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Course-embedded assessments	8 (72.73%)	61 (98.39%)	28 (84.85%)
In-class administration of a standardized exam	6 (54.55%)	35 (56.45%)	17 (51.52%)
Participation in assessment is required outside of class	3 (27.27%)	8 (12.9%)	8 (24.24%)
Educational/outreach efforts (e.g. explaining the importance of assessment)	3 (27.27%)	14 (22.58%)	11 (33.33%)
Monetary incentives	5 (45.45%)	6 (9.68%)	16 (48.48%)
Non-monetary rewards (e.g. event tickets, prize drawings, etc.)	2 (18.18%)	5 (8.06%)	12 (36.36%)

9a) Which of these strategies (if any) do you find to be most effective?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Course-embedded and in-class assessments	7 (63.64%)	44 (70.97%)	24 (72.73%)
External rewards (monetary or non-monetary)	2 (18.18%)	1 (1.61%)	9 (27.27%)
Required participation	2 (18.18%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.06%)
Educational/outreach efforts	1 (9.09%)	0 (0%)	3 (9.09%)
Academic incentives (e.g. bonus points)	1 (9.09%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.06%)

10) Which of the following options would be most helpful in improving general education assessment practices at your institution? (Choose 3)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
More faculty involvement	7 (63.64%)	28 (45.16%)	18 (54.55%)
More student involvement	1 (9.09%)	8 (12.9%)	5 (15.15%)
Emphasis on assessment by institutional leaders	2 (18.18%)	9 (14.52%)	10 (30.3%)
Including student learning in the institutional strategic plan	1 (9.09%)	5 (8.06%)	3 (9.09%)
Additional faculty or staff expertise in assessment methods	8 (72.73%)	33 (53.23%)	18 (54.55%)
Better ways to measure student learning outcomes	2 (18.18%)	23 (37.1%)	10 (30.3%)
Additional resources (e.g. staff, funding)	5 (45.45%)	28 (45.16%)	13 (39.39%)
Information about practices and policies at peer institutions	4 (36.36%)	15 (24.19%)	9 (27.27%)
Agreement on general education/core curriculum learning outcomes throughout the state	3 (27.27%)	26 (41.94%)	9 (27.27%)

11) Please describe one or two practices used by your institution to assess general education competencies that you consider to be working well.

See attached list of responses

12) Please describe one or two significant challenges that your institution faces in assessing general education competencies.

See attached list of responses

**Use of General Education Assessment Findings**

13) With whom and how frequently are institutional-level reports on general education assessment findings shared?

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to	Occasionally	Frequently
Academic administrators	Peer Group	1 (9.09%)	2 (18.18%)	3 (27.27%)	5 (45.45%)
	Two-Year	3 (4.84%)	7 (11.29%)	16 (25.81%)	35 (56.45%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	9 (27.27%)	19 (57.58%)
Faculty	Peer Group	1 (9.09%)	3 (27.27%)	4 (36.36%)	3 (27.27%)
	Two-Year	2 (3.23%)	7 (11.29%)	24 (38.71%)	28 (45.16%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	15 (45.45%)	13 (39.39%)
Staff	Peer Group	3 (27.27%)	3 (27.27%)	4 (36.36%)	1 (9.09%)
	Two-Year	24 (38.71%)	10 (16.13%)	21 (33.87%)	6 (9.68%)
	Four-Year	14 (42.42%)	7 (21.21%)	9 (27.27%)	3 (9.09%)
Students	Peer Group	5 (45.45%)	3 (27.27%)	2 (18.18%)	1 (9.09%)
	Two-Year	26 (41.94%)	18 (29.03%)	17 (27.42%)	0 (0%)
	Four-Year	17 (51.52%)	9 (27.27%)	4 (12.12%)	3 (9.09%)
Governing boards	Peer Group	5 (45.45%)	3 (27.27%)	2 (18.18%)	1 (9.09%)
	Two-Year	14 (22.58%)	12 (19.35%)	26 (41.94%)	9 (14.52%)
	Four-Year	12 (36.36%)	4 (12.12%)	12 (36.36%)	5 (15.15%)
Accreditors (specialized or SACS)	Peer Group	1 (9.09%)	3 (27.27%)	4 (36.36%)	3 (27.27%)
	Two-Year	4 (6.45%)	7 (11.29%)	36 (58.06%)	14 (22.58%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	6 (18.18%)	12 (36.36%)	14 (42.42%)
Government regulatory bodies (state or federal)	Peer Group	4 (36.36%)	2 (18.18%)	2 (18.18%)	3 (27.27%)
	Two-Year	11 (17.74%)	8 (12.9%)	25 (40.32%)	17 (27.42%)
	Four-Year	5 (15.15%)	6 (18.18%)	11 (33.33%)	11 (33.33%)

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to	Occasionally	Frequently
Alumni	Peer Group	7 (63.64%)	3 (27.27%)	1 (9.09%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	44 (70.97%)	11 (17.74%)	6 (9.68%)	0 (0%)
	Four-Year	23 (69.7%)	7 (21.21%)	3 (9.09%)	0 (0%)
General public	Peer Group	7 (63.64%)	3 (27.27%)	1 (9.09%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	33 (53.23%)	13 (20.97%)	13 (20.97%)	2 (3.23%)
	Four-Year	21 (63.64%)	6 (18.18%)	5 (15.15%)	1 (3.03%)

14) Who makes decisions about changes to general education and/or the core curriculum based on assessment findings?  
(Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	8 (72.73%)	46 (74.19%)	20 (60.61%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	2 (18.18%)	4 (6.45%)	8 (24.24%)
Academic affairs committee	1 (9.09%)	24 (38.71%)	6 (18.18%)
General education/core curriculum committee	7 (63.64%)	43 (69.35%)	27 (81.82%)
Deans of individual colleges	6 (54.55%)	11 (17.74%)	16 (48.48%)
Department chairs or departmental undergraduate studies committees	5 (45.45%)	31 (50%)	17 (51.52%)
Faculty members	6 (54.55%)	39 (62.9%)	19 (57.58%)

15) To what extent has your institution used general education competencies assessment findings for each of the following?

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Prepare for institutional accreditation	Peer Group	1 (9.09%)	2 (18.18%)	0 (0%)	8 (72.73%)
	Two-Year	2 (3.23%)	6 (9.68%)	16 (25.81%)	38 (61.29%)
	Four-Year	2 (6.06%)	4 (12.12%)	4 (12.12%)	23 (69.7%)
Prepare for specialized accreditation	Peer Group	3 (27.27%)	2 (18.18%)	4 (36.36%)	2 (18.18%)
	Two-Year	16 (25.81%)	3 (4.84%)	21 (33.87%)	22 (35.48%)
	Four-Year	7 (21.21%)	5 (15.15%)	10 (30.3%)	11 (33.33%)

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Provide data for public accountability (e.g. VSA)	Peer Group	4 (36.36%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (63.64%)
	Two-Year	33 (53.23%)	9 (14.52%)	17 (27.42%)	3 (4.84%)
	Four-Year	5 (15.15%)	3 (9.09%)	5 (15.15%)	20 (60.61%)
Respond to assessment requirements set by THECB and/or governing board	Peer Group	1 (9.09%)	2 (18.18%)	1 (9.09%)	7 (63.64%)
	Two-Year	2 (3.23%)	6 (9.68%)	22 (35.48%)	32 (51.61%)
	Four-Year	2 (6.06%)	6 (18.18%)	7 (21.21%)	18 (54.55%)
Revise general education competencies	Peer Group	2 (18.18%)	5 (45.45%)	2 (18.18%)	2 (18.18%)
	Two-Year	5 (8.06%)	12 (19.35%)	29 (46.77%)	16 (25.81%)
	Four-Year	4 (12.12%)	13 (39.39%)	9 (27.27%)	7 (21.21%)
Make changes to general education/core curriculum	Peer Group	2 (18.18%)	4 (36.36%)	3 (27.27%)	2 (18.18%)
	Two-Year	4 (6.45%)	15 (24.19%)	24 (38.71%)	19 (30.65%)
	Four-Year	3 (9.09%)	13 (39.39%)	8 (24.24%)	9 (27.27%)
Refine assessment process and/or measures	Peer Group	1 (9.09%)	4 (36.36%)	3 (27.27%)	3 (27.27%)
	Two-Year	5 (8.06%)	16 (25.81%)	16 (25.81%)	25 (40.32%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	11 (33.33%)	17 (51.52%)
Determine student readiness for upper-level coursework	Peer Group	6 (54.55%)	4 (36.36%)	0 (0%)	1 (9.09%)
	Two-Year	21 (33.87%)	16 (25.81%)	12 (19.35%)	13 (20.97%)
	Four-Year	18 (54.55%)	9 (27.27%)	4 (12.12%)	2 (6.06%)
Align curricula and/or learning outcomes with K-12 and/or feeder colleges/universities	Peer Group	6 (54.55%)	4 (36.36%)	1 (9.09%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	13 (20.97%)	27 (43.55%)	17 (27.42%)	5 (8.06%)
	Four-Year	16 (48.48%)	8 (24.24%)	5 (15.15%)	4 (12.12%)

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Align curricula and/or learning outcomes between general education and major sequence courses	Peer Group	5 (45.45%)	4 (36.36%)	1 (9.09%)	1 (9.09%)
	Two-Year	20 (32.26%)	19 (30.65%)	14 (22.58%)	9 (14.52%)
	Four-Year	12 (36.36%)	11 (33.33%)	6 (18.18%)	4 (12.12%)
Improve teaching (e.g. faculty development programs)	Peer Group	5 (45.45%)	2 (18.18%)	4 (36.36%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	3 (4.84%)	15 (24.19%)	19 (30.65%)	25 (40.32%)
	Four-Year	10 (30.3%)	7 (21.21%)	11 (33.33%)	5 (15.15%)
Make decisions about faculty tenure, promotion, or merit raises	Peer Group	10 (90.91%)	1 (9.09%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	53 (85.48%)	4 (6.45%)	4 (6.45%)	1 (1.61%)
	Four-Year	29 (87.88%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	0 (0%)
Allocate resources to departments	Peer Group	9 (81.82%)	1 (9.09%)	0 (0%)	1 (9.09%)
	Two-Year	41 (66.13%)	10 (16.13%)	9 (14.52%)	2 (3.23%)
	Four-Year	26 (78.79%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	3 (9.09%)
Recruit prospective students	Peer Group	9 (81.82%)	2 (18.18%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	53 (85.48%)	4 (6.45%)	5 (8.06%)	0 (0%)
	Four-Year	27 (81.82%)	4 (12.12%)	2 (6.06%)	0 (0%)
Make decisions related to strategic planning	Peer Group	5 (45.45%)	4 (36.36%)	1 (9.09%)	1 (9.09%)
	Two-Year	6 (9.68%)	14 (22.58%)	25 (40.32%)	17 (27.42%)
	Four-Year	11 (33.33%)	9 (27.27%)	8 (24.24%)	5 (15.15%)

16) Has your institution made any recent changes to general education and/or the core curriculum as a result of the assessment process?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	3 (27.27%)	24 (38.71%)	11 (33.33%)
No	7 (63.64%)	21 (33.87%)	13 (39.39%)
In Process	1 (9.09%)	15 (24.19%)	9 (27.27%)

16a) (If yes or in process) Please briefly describe the changes to general education and/or the core curriculum and the reasons for making them.

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (39)	Four-Year Institutions (20)
Defined new general education competencies	1 (25%)	1 (2.56%)	5 (25%)
Mapped general education competencies to curriculum	0 (0%)	3 (7.69%)	2 (10%)
Reduced number of hours in core curriculum	0 (0%)	2 (5.13%)	2 (10%)
Added/dropped general education requirements	0 (0%)	6 (15.38%)	2 (10%)
Dropped excess general education courses/streamlined core	0 (0%)	4 (10.26%)	1 (5%)
Added/dropped courses based on coverage of general education competencies	2 (50%)	5 (12.82%)	5 (25%)
Changed general education course content	3 (75%)	6 (15.38%)	7 (35%)
Changed general education assessment plan	1 (25%)	7 (17.95%)	5 (25%)



# General Education Assessment Practices Survey 2009

## TSTC and Lamar Accountability Peer Group Responses

Number of responses from peer group: 7

### Structure of and Resources for General Education Assessment

1) Which offices and/or groups are responsible for the following aspects of assessing general education competencies at your institution? (Choose all that apply)

Peer Group	Selecting Assessment Methods	Developing Assessment Instruments	Collecting & Analyzing Data	Reviewing Assessment Findings	Other Assessment Work
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)	4 (57.14%)	0 (0%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	3 (42.86%)	3 (42.86%)	2 (28.57%)	3 (42.86%)	2 (28.57%)
Office of Institutional Research	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (42.86%)	2 (28.57%)	3 (42.86%)
General education assessment committee	2 (28.57%)	2 (28.57%)	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)
Faculty members	3 (42.86%)	4 (57.14%)	2 (28.57%)	3 (42.86%)	2 (28.57%)
Deans/Division Chairs/Dept. Chairs	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

All Two-Year Institutions (62)	Selecting Assessment Methods	Developing Assessment Instruments	Collecting & Analyzing Data	Reviewing Assessment Findings	Other Assessment Work
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	32 (51.61%)	19 (30.65%)	19 (30.65%)	49 (79.03%)	18 (29.03%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	3 (4.84%)	2 (3.23%)	2 (3.23%)	6 (9.68%)	1 (1.61%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	18 (29.03%)	21 (33.87%)	29 (46.77%)	29 (46.77%)	17 (27.42%)
Office of Institutional Research	17 (27.42%)	23 (37.1%)	37 (59.68%)	29 (46.77%)	23 (37.1%)
General education assessment committee	25 (40.32%)	23 (37.1%)	27 (43.55%)	30 (48.39%)	12 (19.35%)
Faculty members	47 (75.81%)	52 (83.87%)	39 (62.9%)	44 (70.97%)	16 (25.81%)
Deans/Division Chairs/Dept. Chairs	8 (12.9%)	6 (9.68%)	8 (12.9%)	6 (9.68%)	3 (4.84%)

All Four-Year Institutions (33)	Selecting Assessment Methods	Developing Assessment Instruments	Collecting & Analyzing Data	Reviewing Assessment Findings	Other Assessment Work
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	13 (39.39%)	9 (27.27%)	7 (21.21%)	23 (69.7%)	12 (36.36%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	8 (24.24%)	6 (18.18%)	5 (15.15%)	10 (30.3%)	7 (21.21%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	14 (42.42%)	14 (42.42%)	20 (60.61%)	22 (66.67%)	14 (42.42%)
Office of Institutional Research	7 (21.21%)	12 (36.36%)	19 (57.58%)	11 (33.33%)	13 (39.39%)
General education assessment committee	17 (51.52%)	15 (45.45%)	14 (42.42%)	21 (63.64%)	10 (30.3%)
Faculty members	23 (69.7%)	27 (81.82%)	24 (72.73%)	24 (72.73%)	12 (36.36%)
Deans/Division Chairs/Dept. Chairs	1 (3.03%)	1 (3.03%)	2 (6.06%)	4 (12.12%)	2 (6.06%)

2) Please briefly describe the process through which your institution assesses general education competencies.

See attached list of responses

3) Does your institution have one or more staff positions whose primary focus is learning assessment?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	1 (14.29%)	21 (33.87%)	26 (78.79%)
No	6 (85.71%)	41 (66.13%)	7 (21.21%)

3a) (If yes) In what office or offices is this position or positions located? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (21)	Four-Year Institutions (26)
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	0 (0%)	9 (42.86%)	12 (46.15%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (11.54%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	1 (100%)	10 (47.62%)	17 (65.38%)
Office of Institutional Research	0 (0%)	7 (33.33%)	10 (38.46%)
Academic colleges or departments	0 (0%)	1 (4.76%)	5 (19.23%)

4) What resources are available at your institution to support assessment of general education competencies? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Assessment training for faculty or staff as part of formal professional development activities (e.g. in-service sessions, orientation for new faculty)	5 (71.43%)	44 (70.97%)	19 (57.58%)
Optional assessment workshops for faculty or staff	1 (14.29%)	40 (64.52%)	26 (78.79%)
One-on-one consultation with faculty	6 (85.71%)	44 (70.97%)	30 (90.91%)
Funding for faculty or staff to attend assessment conferences or training	6 (85.71%)	53 (85.48%)	27 (81.82%)
Funding or release time for faculty or staff to work on assessment	2 (28.57%)	22 (35.48%)	9 (27.27%)
Books/reference materials on assessment distributed to faculty or staff	2 (28.57%)	44 (70.97%)	23 (69.7%)

5) Does your institution use centralized software for assessment data collection and reporting?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	2 (28.57%)	23 (37.1%)	22 (66.67%)
No	5 (71.43%)	23 (37.1%)	7 (21.21%)
In Process	0 (0%)	16 (25.81%)	4 (12.12%)

5a) (If yes or in process) Which software package do you use or plan to use? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (39)	Four-Year Institutions (26)
Blackboard	1 (50%)	6 (15.38%)	7 (26.92%)
Datatel	1 (50%)	3 (7.69%)	1 (3.85%)
Strategic Planning Online (SPOL)	0 (0%)	8 (20.51%)	1 (3.85%)
Task Stream	1 (50%)	2 (5.13%)	4 (15.38%)
Tk20	0 (0%)	1 (2.56%)	1 (3.85%)
TracDat	0 (0%)	5 (12.82%)	5 (19.23%)
Weave Online	0 (0%)	8 (20.51%)	8 (30.77%)
Locally-developed software	0 (0%)	9 (23.08%)	5 (19.23%)
OATS	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (7.69%)
Banner	0 (0%)	1 (2.08%)	1 (3.85%)
Other	0 (0%)	7 (14.58%)	3 (11.54%)

5b) (If yes or in process) How long have you been using this software package?

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (39)	Four-Year Institutions (26)
In process of adopting	0 (0%)	8 (20.51%)	3 (11.54%)
Less than 1 year	0 (0%)	8 (20.51%)	9 (34.62%)
Between 1 and 3 years	1 (50%)	5 (12.82%)	3 (11.54%)
3 years	0 (0%)	5 (12.82%)	6 (23.08%)
4 or more years	1 (50%)	3 (7.69%)	4 (15.38%)
Use multiple programs	0 (0%)	5 (12.82%)	1 (3.85%)

**General Education Assessment Practices**

6) What is the cycle on which your institution assesses all general education competencies and reviews the assessment findings (recognizing that specific competencies may be assessed on a more frequent schedule)?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Every semester	3 (42.86%)	9 (14.52%)	3 (9.09%)
Every year	0 (0%)	25 (40.32%)	12 (36.36%)
Every two years	2 (28.57%)	6 (9.68%)	4 (12.12%)
Every 2-3 years	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.06%)
Every three years or beyond	2 (28.57%)	18 (29.03%)	7 (21.21%)
In process of determining	0 (0%)	2 (3.23%)	3 (9.09%)

7) Does your institution use general knowledge and skills exams to assess general education competencies (e.g. CAAP, CLA, MAPP)?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	4 (57.14%)	17 (27.42%)	29 (87.88%)
No	3 (42.86%)	41 (66.13%)	1 (3.03%)
In Process	0 (0%)	4 (6.45%)	3 (9.09%)

7a) (If yes) Which standardized exam(s) is/are used to measure general education competencies at your institution? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (21)	Four-Year Institutions (32)
CAAP	2 (50%)	9 (42.86%)	7 (21.88%)
CBASE	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.13%)
CCTST	0 (0%)	1 (4.76%)	1 (3.13%)
CLA	1 (25%)	2 (9.52%)	15 (46.88%)
MAPP	0 (0%)	7 (33.33%)	11 (34.38%)
WorkKeys	2 (50%)	2 (9.52%)	0 (0%)
Institutionally-developed exam	0 (0%)	2 (9.52%)	3 (9.38%)
NSF Critical Thinking Assessment	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.13%)

7b) (If yes) Which students at your institution take the general knowledge and skills exam(s)? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (21)	Four-Year Institutions (32)
All students completing general education and/or core curriculum (e.g. rising junior exam)	3 (75%)	3 (14.29%)	1 (3.13%)
All graduating students	1 (25%)	1 (4.76%)	1 (3.13%)
A sample of students completing general education and/or core curriculum	0 (0%)	11 (52.38%)	5 (15.63%)
A sample of graduating students	0 (0%)	4 (19.05%)	4 (12.5%)
A sample of first-year and senior students	0 (0%)	2 (9.52%)	23 (71.88%)

8) Which methods of assessing general education competencies are used at your institution and to what extent?

	Institutional Type	Never Used	Used in Past But Not Now	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Course grades in general education and/or core curriculum classes	Peer Group	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)	3 (42.86%)
	Two-Year	16 (25.81%)	12 (19.35%)	2 (3.23%)	11 (17.74%)	21 (33.87%)
	Four-Year	24 (72.73%)	4 (12.12%)	1 (3.03%)	1 (3.03%)	3 (9.09%)
Course grades in more advanced classes that build on general education and/or core curriculum classes	Peer Group	3 (42.86%)	0 (0%)	3 (42.86%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)
	Two-Year	33 (53.23%)	2 (3.23%)	5 (8.06%)	13 (20.97%)	9 (14.52%)
	Four-Year	27 (81.82%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	1 (3.03%)	1 (3.03%)

	Institutional Type	Never Used	Used in Past But Not Now	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Student work from individual course sections (e.g. quizzes, exams, essays, research papers)	Peer Group	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)	4 (57.14%)
	Two-Year	1 (1.61%)	1 (1.61%)	5 (8.06%)	13 (20.97%)	42 (67.74%)
	Four-Year	4 (12.12%)	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	4 (12.12%)	20 (60.61%)
Common exams, exam questions, assignments, and/or grading rubrics to assess student work across course sections	Peer Group	2 (28.57%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)	3 (42.86%)
	Two-Year	3 (4.84%)	0 (0%)	6 (9.68%)	18 (29.03%)	35 (56.45%)
	Four-Year	2 (6.06%)	0 (0%)	4 (12.12%)	7 (21.21%)	20 (60.61%)
Observations of student performance (e.g. simulations, labs, recitals)	Peer Group	2 (28.57%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)	3 (42.86%)
	Two-Year	6 (9.68%)	0 (0%)	6 (9.68%)	29 (46.77%)	21 (33.87%)
	Four-Year	4 (12.12%)	0 (0%)	7 (21.21%)	13 (39.39%)	9 (27.27%)
Cumulative assessments (e.g. capstone projects, portfolios)	Peer Group	2 (28.57%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	4 (57.14%)
	Two-Year	14 (22.58%)	0 (0%)	10 (16.13%)	21 (33.87%)	17 (27.42%)
	Four-Year	6 (18.18%)	0 (0%)	9 (27.27%)	13 (39.39%)	5 (15.15%)
Student surveys (e.g. NSSE/CCSSE, CIRP surveys, locally-developed surveys)	Peer Group	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)	2 (28.57%)	3 (42.86%)
	Two-Year	7 (11.29%)	2 (3.23%)	4 (6.45%)	18 (29.03%)	31 (50%)
	Four-Year	5 (15.15%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.03%)	6 (18.18%)	21 (63.64%)
Faculty surveys	Peer Group	5 (71.43%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)
	Two-Year	29 (46.77%)	1 (1.61%)	9 (14.52%)	17 (27.42%)	6 (9.68%)
	Four-Year	19 (57.58%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.03%)	9 (27.27%)	4 (12.12%)
Alumni or graduate surveys	Peer Group	4 (57.14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	2 (28.57%)
	Two-Year	24 (38.71%)	3 (4.84%)	4 (6.45%)	20 (32.26%)	11 (17.74%)
	Four-Year	7 (21.21%)	3 (9.09%)	5 (15.15%)	7 (21.21%)	11 (33.33%)



	Institutional Type	Never Used	Used in Past But Not Now	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Employer surveys or advisory groups	Peer Group	4 (57.14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (42.86%)
	Two-Year	19 (30.65%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.61%)	26 (41.94%)	16 (25.81%)
	Four-Year	12 (36.36%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	13 (39.39%)	4 (12.12%)
Student focus groups	Peer Group	4 (57.14%)	0 (0%)	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	27 (43.55%)	3 (4.84%)	10 (16.13%)	18 (29.03%)	4 (6.45%)
	Four-Year	20 (60.61%)	0 (0%)	7 (21.21%)	6 (18.18%)	0 (0%)
Student success measures (e.g. transfer rates, graduation rates, etc.)	Peer Group	3 (42.86%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (57.14%)
	Two-Year	13 (20.97%)	0 (0%)	3 (4.84%)	9 (14.52%)	37 (59.68%)
	Four-Year	17 (51.52%)	0 (0%)	3 (9.09%)	6 (18.18%)	7 (21.21%)
Data on student performance after transfer or graduation	Peer Group	4 (57.14%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)	2 (28.57%)
	Two-Year	14 (22.58%)	0 (0%)	8 (12.9%)	27 (43.55%)	13 (20.97%)
	Four-Year	20 (60.61%)	0 (0%)	5 (15.15%)	5 (15.15%)	3 (9.09%)

9) What strategies are used to involve students in the general education assessment process at your institution? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Course-embedded assessments	7 (100%)	61 (98.39%)	28 (84.85%)
In-class administration of a standardized exam	4 (57.14%)	35 (56.45%)	17 (51.52%)
Participation in assessment is required outside of class	4 (57.14%)	8 (12.9%)	8 (24.24%)
Educational/outreach efforts (e.g. explaining the importance of assessment)	1 (14.29%)	14 (22.58%)	11 (33.33%)
Monetary incentives	0 (0%)	6 (9.68%)	16 (48.48%)
Non-monetary rewards (e.g. event tickets, prize drawings, etc.)	0 (0%)	5 (8.06%)	12 (36.36%)

9a) Which of these strategies (if any) do you find to be most effective?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Course-embedded and in-class assessments	5 (71.43%)	44 (70.97%)	24 (72.73%)
External rewards (monetary or non-monetary)	0 (0%)	1 (1.61%)	9 (27.27%)
Required participation	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.06%)
Educational/outreach efforts	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (9.09%)
Academic incentives (e.g. bonus points)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.06%)

10) Which of the following options would be most helpful in improving general education assessment practices at your institution? (Choose 3)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
More faculty involvement	2 (28.57%)	28 (45.16%)	18 (54.55%)
More student involvement	0 (0%)	8 (12.9%)	5 (15.15%)
Emphasis on assessment by institutional leaders	2 (28.57%)	9 (14.52%)	10 (30.3%)
Including student learning in the institutional strategic plan	1 (14.29%)	5 (8.06%)	3 (9.09%)
Additional faculty or staff expertise in assessment methods	3 (42.86%)	33 (53.23%)	18 (54.55%)
Better ways to measure student learning outcomes	3 (42.86%)	23 (37.1%)	10 (30.3%)
Additional resources (e.g. staff, funding)	3 (42.86%)	28 (45.16%)	13 (39.39%)
Information about practices and policies at peer institutions	2 (28.57%)	15 (24.19%)	9 (27.27%)
Agreement on general education/core curriculum learning outcomes throughout the state	3 (42.86%)	26 (41.94%)	9 (27.27%)

11) Please describe one or two practices used by your institution to assess general education competencies that you consider to be working well.

See attached list of responses

12) Please describe one or two significant challenges that your institution faces in assessing general education competencies.

See attached list of responses

**Use of General Education Assessment Findings**

13) With whom and how frequently are institutional-level reports on general education assessment findings shared?

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to	Occasionally	Frequently
Academic administrators	Peer Group	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)	2 (28.57%)	4 (57.14%)
	Two-Year	3 (4.84%)	7 (11.29%)	16 (25.81%)	35 (56.45%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	9 (27.27%)	19 (57.58%)
Faculty	Peer Group	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	3 (42.86%)	3 (42.86%)
	Two-Year	2 (3.23%)	7 (11.29%)	24 (38.71%)	28 (45.16%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	15 (45.45%)	13 (39.39%)
Staff	Peer Group	4 (57.14%)	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)
	Two-Year	24 (38.71%)	10 (16.13%)	21 (33.87%)	6 (9.68%)
	Four-Year	14 (42.42%)	7 (21.21%)	9 (27.27%)	3 (9.09%)
Students	Peer Group	6 (85.71%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	26 (41.94%)	18 (29.03%)	17 (27.42%)	0 (0%)
	Four-Year	17 (51.52%)	9 (27.27%)	4 (12.12%)	3 (9.09%)
Governing boards	Peer Group	3 (42.86%)	1 (14.29%)	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)
	Two-Year	14 (22.58%)	12 (19.35%)	26 (41.94%)	9 (14.52%)
	Four-Year	12 (36.36%)	4 (12.12%)	12 (36.36%)	5 (15.15%)
Accreditors (specialized or SACS)	Peer Group	2 (28.57%)	0 (0%)	3 (42.86%)	2 (28.57%)
	Two-Year	4 (6.45%)	7 (11.29%)	36 (58.06%)	14 (22.58%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	6 (18.18%)	12 (36.36%)	14 (42.42%)
Government regulatory bodies (state or federal)	Peer Group	3 (42.86%)	0 (0%)	2 (28.57%)	2 (28.57%)
	Two-Year	11 (17.74%)	8 (12.9%)	25 (40.32%)	17 (27.42%)
	Four-Year	5 (15.15%)	6 (18.18%)	11 (33.33%)	11 (33.33%)

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to	Occasionally	Frequently
Alumni	Peer Group	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	44 (70.97%)	11 (17.74%)	6 (9.68%)	0 (0%)
	Four-Year	23 (69.7%)	7 (21.21%)	3 (9.09%)	0 (0%)
General public	Peer Group	6 (85.71%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)
	Two-Year	33 (53.23%)	13 (20.97%)	13 (20.97%)	2 (3.23%)
	Four-Year	21 (63.64%)	6 (18.18%)	5 (15.15%)	1 (3.03%)

14) Who makes decisions about changes to general education and/or the core curriculum based on assessment findings?  
(Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	4 (57.14%)	46 (74.19%)	20 (60.61%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	0 (0%)	4 (6.45%)	8 (24.24%)
Academic affairs committee	1 (14.29%)	24 (38.71%)	6 (18.18%)
General education/core curriculum committee	3 (42.86%)	43 (69.35%)	27 (81.82%)
Deans of individual colleges	1 (14.29%)	11 (17.74%)	16 (48.48%)
Department chairs or departmental undergraduate studies committees	3 (42.86%)	31 (50%)	17 (51.52%)
Faculty members	3 (42.86%)	39 (62.9%)	19 (57.58%)

15) To what extent has your institution used general education competencies assessment findings for each of the following?

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Prepare for institutional accreditation	Peer Group	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)	3 (42.86%)	3 (42.86%)
	Two-Year	2 (3.23%)	6 (9.68%)	16 (25.81%)	38 (61.29%)
	Four-Year	2 (6.06%)	4 (12.12%)	4 (12.12%)	23 (69.7%)
Prepare for specialized accreditation	Peer Group	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)	2 (28.57%)	2 (28.57%)
	Two-Year	16 (25.81%)	3 (4.84%)	21 (33.87%)	22 (35.48%)
	Four-Year	7 (21.21%)	5 (15.15%)	10 (30.3%)	11 (33.33%)

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Provide data for public accountability (e.g. VSA)	Peer Group	5 (71.43%)	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	33 (53.23%)	9 (14.52%)	17 (27.42%)	3 (4.84%)
	Four-Year	5 (15.15%)	3 (9.09%)	5 (15.15%)	20 (60.61%)
Respond to assessment requirements set by THECB and/or governing board	Peer Group	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)	4 (57.14%)
	Two-Year	2 (3.23%)	6 (9.68%)	22 (35.48%)	32 (51.61%)
	Four-Year	2 (6.06%)	6 (18.18%)	7 (21.21%)	18 (54.55%)
Revise general education competencies	Peer Group	0 (0%)	2 (28.57%)	3 (42.86%)	2 (28.57%)
	Two-Year	5 (8.06%)	12 (19.35%)	29 (46.77%)	16 (25.81%)
	Four-Year	4 (12.12%)	13 (39.39%)	9 (27.27%)	7 (21.21%)
Make changes to general education/core curriculum	Peer Group	1 (14.29%)	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)	3 (42.86%)
	Two-Year	4 (6.45%)	15 (24.19%)	24 (38.71%)	19 (30.65%)
	Four-Year	3 (9.09%)	13 (39.39%)	8 (24.24%)	9 (27.27%)
Refine assessment process and/or measures	Peer Group	1 (14.29%)	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)	3 (42.86%)
	Two-Year	5 (8.06%)	16 (25.81%)	16 (25.81%)	25 (40.32%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	11 (33.33%)	17 (51.52%)
Determine student readiness for upper-level coursework	Peer Group	2 (28.57%)	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)	2 (28.57%)
	Two-Year	21 (33.87%)	16 (25.81%)	12 (19.35%)	13 (20.97%)
	Four-Year	18 (54.55%)	9 (27.27%)	4 (12.12%)	2 (6.06%)
Align curricula and/or learning outcomes with K-12 and/or feeder colleges/universities	Peer Group	0 (0%)	4 (57.14%)	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)
	Two-Year	13 (20.97%)	27 (43.55%)	17 (27.42%)	5 (8.06%)
	Four-Year	16 (48.48%)	8 (24.24%)	5 (15.15%)	4 (12.12%)

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Align curricula and/or learning outcomes between general education and major sequence courses	Peer Group	2 (28.57%)	4 (57.14%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)
	Two-Year	20 (32.26%)	19 (30.65%)	14 (22.58%)	9 (14.52%)
	Four-Year	12 (36.36%)	11 (33.33%)	6 (18.18%)	4 (12.12%)
Improve teaching (e.g. faculty development programs)	Peer Group	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)	4 (57.14%)	2 (28.57%)
	Two-Year	3 (4.84%)	15 (24.19%)	19 (30.65%)	25 (40.32%)
	Four-Year	10 (30.3%)	7 (21.21%)	11 (33.33%)	5 (15.15%)
Make decisions about faculty tenure, promotion, or merit raises	Peer Group	5 (71.43%)	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	53 (85.48%)	4 (6.45%)	4 (6.45%)	1 (1.61%)
	Four-Year	29 (87.88%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	0 (0%)
Allocate resources to departments	Peer Group	4 (57.14%)	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	41 (66.13%)	10 (16.13%)	9 (14.52%)	2 (3.23%)
	Four-Year	26 (78.79%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	3 (9.09%)
Recruit prospective students	Peer Group	6 (85.71%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	53 (85.48%)	4 (6.45%)	5 (8.06%)	0 (0%)
	Four-Year	27 (81.82%)	4 (12.12%)	2 (6.06%)	0 (0%)
Make decisions related to strategic planning	Peer Group	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	4 (57.14%)	2 (28.57%)
	Two-Year	6 (9.68%)	14 (22.58%)	25 (40.32%)	17 (27.42%)
	Four-Year	11 (33.33%)	9 (27.27%)	8 (24.24%)	5 (15.15%)

16) Has your institution made any recent changes to general education and/or the core curriculum as a result of the assessment process?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	3 (42.86%)	24 (38.71%)	11 (33.33%)
No	2 (28.57%)	21 (33.87%)	13 (39.39%)
In Process	2 (28.57%)	15 (24.19%)	9 (27.27%)

16a) (If yes or in process) Please briefly describe the changes to general education and/or the core curriculum and the reasons for making them.

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (39)	Four-Year Institutions (20)
Defined new general education competencies	0 (0%)	1 (2.56%)	5 (25%)
Mapped general education competencies to curriculum	0 (0%)	3 (7.69%)	2 (10%)
Reduced number of hours in core curriculum	0 (0%)	2 (5.13%)	2 (10%)
Added/dropped general education requirements	0 (0%)	6 (15.38%)	2 (10%)
Dropped excess general education courses/streamlined core	1 (20%)	4 (10.26%)	1 (5%)
Added/dropped courses based on coverage of general education competencies	0 (0%)	5 (12.82%)	5 (25%)
Changed general education course content	1 (20%)	6 (15.38%)	7 (35%)
Changed general education assessment plan	4 (80%)	7 (17.95%)	5 (25%)



# General Education Assessment Practices Survey 2009

## Very Large Community Colleges Accountability Peer Group Responses

Number of responses from peer group: 18

### Structure of and Resources for General Education Assessment

1) Which offices and/or groups are responsible for the following aspects of assessing general education competencies at your institution? (Choose all that apply)

Peer Group	Selecting Assessment Methods	Developing Assessment Instruments	Collecting & Analyzing Data	Reviewing Assessment Findings	Other Assessment Work
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	12 (66.67%)	7 (38.89%)	7 (38.89%)	15 (83.33%)	7 (38.89%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	6 (33.33%)	6 (33.33%)	11 (61.11%)	11 (61.11%)	6 (33.33%)
Office of Institutional Research	12 (66.67%)	13 (72.22%)	15 (83.33%)	13 (72.22%)	7 (38.89%)
General education assessment committee	12 (66.67%)	13 (72.22%)	10 (55.56%)	12 (66.67%)	5 (27.78%)
Faculty members	15 (83.33%)	16 (88.89%)	13 (72.22%)	15 (83.33%)	5 (27.78%)
Deans/Division Chairs/Dept. Chairs	2 (11.11%)	1 (5.56%)	2 (11.11%)	2 (11.11%)	1 (5.56%)

All Two-Year Institutions (62)	Selecting Assessment Methods	Developing Assessment Instruments	Collecting & Analyzing Data	Reviewing Assessment Findings	Other Assessment Work
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	32 (51.61%)	19 (30.65%)	19 (30.65%)	49 (79.03%)	18 (29.03%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	3 (4.84%)	2 (3.23%)	2 (3.23%)	6 (9.68%)	1 (1.61%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	18 (29.03%)	21 (33.87%)	29 (46.77%)	29 (46.77%)	17 (27.42%)
Office of Institutional Research	17 (27.42%)	23 (37.1%)	37 (59.68%)	29 (46.77%)	23 (37.1%)
General education assessment committee	25 (40.32%)	23 (37.1%)	27 (43.55%)	30 (48.39%)	12 (19.35%)
Faculty members	47 (75.81%)	52 (83.87%)	39 (62.9%)	44 (70.97%)	16 (25.81%)
Deans/Division Chairs/Dept. Chairs	8 (12.9%)	6 (9.68%)	8 (12.9%)	6 (9.68%)	3 (4.84%)

All Four-Year Institutions (33)	Selecting Assessment Methods	Developing Assessment Instruments	Collecting & Analyzing Data	Reviewing Assessment Findings	Other Assessment Work
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	13 (39.39%)	9 (27.27%)	7 (21.21%)	23 (69.7%)	12 (36.36%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	8 (24.24%)	6 (18.18%)	5 (15.15%)	10 (30.3%)	7 (21.21%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	14 (42.42%)	14 (42.42%)	20 (60.61%)	22 (66.67%)	14 (42.42%)
Office of Institutional Research	7 (21.21%)	12 (36.36%)	19 (57.58%)	11 (33.33%)	13 (39.39%)
General education assessment committee	17 (51.52%)	15 (45.45%)	14 (42.42%)	21 (63.64%)	10 (30.3%)
Faculty members	23 (69.7%)	27 (81.82%)	24 (72.73%)	24 (72.73%)	12 (36.36%)
Deans/Division Chairs/Dept. Chairs	1 (3.03%)	1 (3.03%)	2 (6.06%)	4 (12.12%)	2 (6.06%)

2) Please briefly describe the process through which your institution assesses general education competencies.

See attached list of responses

3) Does your institution have one or more staff positions whose primary focus is learning assessment?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	10 (55.56%)	21 (33.87%)	26 (78.79%)
No	8 (44.44%)	41 (66.13%)	7 (21.21%)

3a) (If yes) In what office or offices is this position or positions located? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (21)	Four-Year Institutions (26)
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	6 (60%)	9 (42.86%)	12 (46.15%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (11.54%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	2 (20%)	10 (47.62%)	17 (65.38%)
Office of Institutional Research	2 (20%)	7 (33.33%)	10 (38.46%)
Academic colleges or departments	0 (0%)	1 (4.76%)	5 (19.23%)

4) What resources are available at your institution to support assessment of general education competencies? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Assessment training for faculty or staff as part of formal professional development activities (e.g. in-service sessions, orientation for new faculty)	16 (88.89%)	44 (70.97%)	19 (57.58%)
Optional assessment workshops for faculty or staff	16 (88.89%)	40 (64.52%)	26 (78.79%)
One-on-one consultation with faculty	14 (77.78%)	44 (70.97%)	30 (90.91%)
Funding for faculty or staff to attend assessment conferences or training	17 (94.44%)	53 (85.48%)	27 (81.82%)
Funding or release time for faculty or staff to work on assessment	13 (72.22%)	22 (35.48%)	9 (27.27%)
Books/reference materials on assessment distributed to faculty or staff	15 (83.33%)	44 (70.97%)	23 (69.7%)

5) Does your institution use centralized software for assessment data collection and reporting?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	8 (44.44%)	23 (37.1%)	22 (66.67%)
No	4 (22.22%)	23 (37.1%)	7 (21.21%)
In Process	6 (33.33%)	16 (25.81%)	4 (12.12%)

5a) (If yes or in process) Which software package do you use or plan to use? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (39)	Four-Year Institutions (26)
Blackboard	4 (28.57%)	6 (15.38%)	7 (26.92%)
Datatel	1 (7.14%)	3 (7.69%)	1 (3.85%)
Strategic Planning Online (SPOL)	3 (21.43%)	8 (20.51%)	1 (3.85%)
Task Stream	0 (0%)	2 (5.13%)	4 (15.38%)
Tk20	0 (0%)	1 (2.56%)	1 (3.85%)
TracDat	2 (14.29%)	5 (12.82%)	5 (19.23%)
Weave Online	4 (28.57%)	8 (20.51%)	8 (30.77%)
Locally-developed software	2 (14.29%)	9 (23.08%)	5 (19.23%)
OATS	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (7.69%)
Banner	0 (0%)	1 (2.08%)	1 (3.85%)
Other	3 (21.43%)	7 (14.58%)	3 (11.54%)

5b) (If yes or in process) How long have you been using this software package?

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (39)	Four-Year Institutions (26)
In process of adopting	4 (28.57%)	8 (20.51%)	3 (11.54%)
Less than 1 year	3 (21.43%)	8 (20.51%)	9 (34.62%)
Between 1 and 3 years	2 (14.29%)	5 (12.82%)	3 (11.54%)
3 years	1 (7.14%)	5 (12.82%)	6 (23.08%)
4 or more years	1 (7.14%)	3 (7.69%)	4 (15.38%)
Use multiple programs	2 (14.29%)	5 (12.82%)	1 (3.85%)

**General Education Assessment Practices**

6) What is the cycle on which your institution assesses all general education competencies and reviews the assessment findings (recognizing that specific competencies may be assessed on a more frequent schedule)?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Every semester	1 (5.56%)	9 (14.52%)	3 (9.09%)
Every year	6 (33.33%)	25 (40.32%)	12 (36.36%)
Every two years	3 (16.67%)	6 (9.68%)	4 (12.12%)
Every 2-3 years	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.06%)
Every three years or beyond	5 (27.78%)	18 (29.03%)	7 (21.21%)
In process of determining	1 (5.56%)	2 (3.23%)	3 (9.09%)

7) Does your institution use general knowledge and skills exams to assess general education competencies (e.g. CAAP, CLA, MAPP)?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	6 (33.33%)	17 (27.42%)	29 (87.88%)
No	10 (55.56%)	41 (66.13%)	1 (3.03%)
In Process	2 (11.11%)	4 (6.45%)	3 (9.09%)

7a) (If yes) Which standardized exam(s) is/are used to measure general education competencies at your institution? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (21)	Four-Year Institutions (32)
CAAP	3 (37.5%)	9 (42.86%)	7 (21.88%)
CBASE	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.13%)
CCTST	1 (12.5%)	1 (4.76%)	1 (3.13%)
CLA	1 (12.5%)	2 (9.52%)	15 (46.88%)
MAPP	3 (37.5%)	7 (33.33%)	11 (34.38%)
WorkKeys	0 (0%)	2 (9.52%)	0 (0%)
Institutionally-developed exam	1 (12.5%)	2 (9.52%)	3 (9.38%)
NSF Critical Thinking Assessment	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.13%)

7b) (If yes) Which students at your institution take the general knowledge and skills exam(s)? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (21)	Four-Year Institutions (32)
All students completing general education and/or core curriculum (e.g. rising junior exam)	0 (0%)	3 (14.29%)	1 (3.13%)
All graduating students	0 (0%)	1 (4.76%)	1 (3.13%)
A sample of students completing general education and/or core curriculum	5 (62.5%)	11 (52.38%)	5 (15.63%)
A sample of graduating students	2 (25%)	4 (19.05%)	4 (12.5%)
A sample of first-year and senior students	1 (12.5%)	2 (9.52%)	23 (71.88%)

8) Which methods of assessing general education competencies are used at your institution and to what extent?

	Institutional Type	Never Used	Used in Past But Not Now	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Course grades in general education and/or core curriculum classes	Peer Group	6 (33.33%)	3 (16.67%)	1 (5.56%)	0 (0%)	8 (44.44%)
	Two-Year	16 (25.81%)	12 (19.35%)	2 (3.23%)	11 (17.74%)	21 (33.87%)
	Four-Year	24 (72.73%)	4 (12.12%)	1 (3.03%)	1 (3.03%)	3 (9.09%)
Course grades in more advanced classes that build on general education and/or core curriculum classes	Peer Group	9 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (11.11%)	3 (16.67%)	4 (22.22%)
	Two-Year	33 (53.23%)	2 (3.23%)	5 (8.06%)	13 (20.97%)	9 (14.52%)
	Four-Year	27 (81.82%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	1 (3.03%)	1 (3.03%)

	Institutional Type	Never Used	Used in Past But Not Now	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Student work from individual course sections (e.g. quizzes, exams, essays, research papers)	Peer Group	0 (0%)	1 (5.56%)	1 (5.56%)	3 (16.67%)	13 (72.22%)
	Two-Year	1 (1.61%)	1 (1.61%)	5 (8.06%)	13 (20.97%)	42 (67.74%)
	Four-Year	4 (12.12%)	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	4 (12.12%)	20 (60.61%)
Common exams, exam questions, assignments, and/or grading rubrics to assess student work across course sections	Peer Group	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (11.11%)	5 (27.78%)	11 (61.11%)
	Two-Year	3 (4.84%)	0 (0%)	6 (9.68%)	18 (29.03%)	35 (56.45%)
	Four-Year	2 (6.06%)	0 (0%)	4 (12.12%)	7 (21.21%)	20 (60.61%)
Observations of student performance (e.g. simulations, labs, recitals)	Peer Group	1 (5.56%)	0 (0%)	3 (16.67%)	8 (44.44%)	6 (33.33%)
	Two-Year	6 (9.68%)	0 (0%)	6 (9.68%)	29 (46.77%)	21 (33.87%)
	Four-Year	4 (12.12%)	0 (0%)	7 (21.21%)	13 (39.39%)	9 (27.27%)
Cumulative assessments (e.g. capstone projects, portfolios)	Peer Group	1 (5.56%)	0 (0%)	5 (27.78%)	7 (38.89%)	5 (27.78%)
	Two-Year	14 (22.58%)	0 (0%)	10 (16.13%)	21 (33.87%)	17 (27.42%)
	Four-Year	6 (18.18%)	0 (0%)	9 (27.27%)	13 (39.39%)	5 (15.15%)
Student surveys (e.g. NSSE/CCSSE, CIRP surveys, locally-developed surveys)	Peer Group	1 (5.56%)	1 (5.56%)	2 (11.11%)	3 (16.67%)	11 (61.11%)
	Two-Year	7 (11.29%)	2 (3.23%)	4 (6.45%)	18 (29.03%)	31 (50%)
	Four-Year	5 (15.15%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.03%)	6 (18.18%)	21 (63.64%)
Faculty surveys	Peer Group	9 (50%)	0 (0%)	3 (16.67%)	5 (27.78%)	1 (5.56%)
	Two-Year	29 (46.77%)	1 (1.61%)	9 (14.52%)	17 (27.42%)	6 (9.68%)
	Four-Year	19 (57.58%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.03%)	9 (27.27%)	4 (12.12%)
Alumni or graduate surveys	Peer Group	7 (38.89%)	0 (0%)	1 (5.56%)	7 (38.89%)	3 (16.67%)
	Two-Year	24 (38.71%)	3 (4.84%)	4 (6.45%)	20 (32.26%)	11 (17.74%)
	Four-Year	7 (21.21%)	3 (9.09%)	5 (15.15%)	7 (21.21%)	11 (33.33%)



	Institutional Type	Never Used	Used in Past But Not Now	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Employer surveys or advisory groups	Peer Group	5 (27.78%)	0 (0%)	1 (5.56%)	5 (27.78%)	7 (38.89%)
	Two-Year	19 (30.65%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.61%)	26 (41.94%)	16 (25.81%)
	Four-Year	12 (36.36%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	13 (39.39%)	4 (12.12%)
Student focus groups	Peer Group	5 (27.78%)	0 (0%)	3 (16.67%)	8 (44.44%)	2 (11.11%)
	Two-Year	27 (43.55%)	3 (4.84%)	10 (16.13%)	18 (29.03%)	4 (6.45%)
	Four-Year	20 (60.61%)	0 (0%)	7 (21.21%)	6 (18.18%)	0 (0%)
Student success measures (e.g. transfer rates, graduation rates, etc.)	Peer Group	1 (5.56%)	0 (0%)	1 (5.56%)	3 (16.67%)	13 (72.22%)
	Two-Year	13 (20.97%)	0 (0%)	3 (4.84%)	9 (14.52%)	37 (59.68%)
	Four-Year	17 (51.52%)	0 (0%)	3 (9.09%)	6 (18.18%)	7 (21.21%)
Data on student performance after transfer or graduation	Peer Group	1 (5.56%)	0 (0%)	4 (22.22%)	10 (55.56%)	3 (16.67%)
	Two-Year	14 (22.58%)	0 (0%)	8 (12.9%)	27 (43.55%)	13 (20.97%)
	Four-Year	20 (60.61%)	0 (0%)	5 (15.15%)	5 (15.15%)	3 (9.09%)

9) What strategies are used to involve students in the general education assessment process at your institution? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Course-embedded assessments	18 (100%)	61 (98.39%)	28 (84.85%)
In-class administration of a standardized exam	11 (61.11%)	35 (56.45%)	17 (51.52%)
Participation in assessment is required outside of class	1 (5.56%)	8 (12.9%)	8 (24.24%)
Educational/outreach efforts (e.g. explaining the importance of assessment)	7 (38.89%)	14 (22.58%)	11 (33.33%)
Monetary incentives	2 (11.11%)	6 (9.68%)	16 (48.48%)
Non-monetary rewards (e.g. event tickets, prize drawings, etc.)	1 (5.56%)	5 (8.06%)	12 (36.36%)

9a) Which of these strategies (if any) do you find to be most effective?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Course-embedded and in-class assessments	11 (61.11%)	44 (70.97%)	24 (72.73%)
External rewards (monetary or non-monetary)	0 (0%)	1 (1.61%)	9 (27.27%)
Required participation	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.06%)
Educational/outreach efforts	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (9.09%)
Academic incentives (e.g. bonus points)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.06%)

10) Which of the following options would be most helpful in improving general education assessment practices at your institution? (Choose 3)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
More faculty involvement	11 (61.11%)	28 (45.16%)	18 (54.55%)
More student involvement	3 (16.67%)	8 (12.9%)	5 (15.15%)
Emphasis on assessment by institutional leaders	3 (16.67%)	9 (14.52%)	10 (30.3%)
Including student learning in the institutional strategic plan	1 (5.56%)	5 (8.06%)	3 (9.09%)
Additional faculty or staff expertise in assessment methods	10 (55.56%)	33 (53.23%)	18 (54.55%)
Better ways to measure student learning outcomes	8 (44.44%)	23 (37.1%)	10 (30.3%)
Additional resources (e.g. staff, funding)	7 (38.89%)	28 (45.16%)	13 (39.39%)
Information about practices and policies at peer institutions	3 (16.67%)	15 (24.19%)	9 (27.27%)
Agreement on general education/core curriculum learning outcomes throughout the state	6 (33.33%)	26 (41.94%)	9 (27.27%)

11) Please describe one or two practices used by your institution to assess general education competencies that you consider to be working well.

See attached list of responses

12) Please describe one or two significant challenges that your institution faces in assessing general education competencies.

See attached list of responses

**Use of General Education Assessment Findings**

13) With whom and how frequently are institutional-level reports on general education assessment findings shared?

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to	Occasionally	Frequently
Academic administrators	Peer Group	1 (5.56%)	2 (11.11%)	2 (11.11%)	12 (66.67%)
	Two-Year	3 (4.84%)	7 (11.29%)	16 (25.81%)	35 (56.45%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	9 (27.27%)	19 (57.58%)
Faculty	Peer Group	1 (5.56%)	1 (5.56%)	6 (33.33%)	9 (50%)
	Two-Year	2 (3.23%)	7 (11.29%)	24 (38.71%)	28 (45.16%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	15 (45.45%)	13 (39.39%)
Staff	Peer Group	6 (33.33%)	2 (11.11%)	7 (38.89%)	2 (11.11%)
	Two-Year	24 (38.71%)	10 (16.13%)	21 (33.87%)	6 (9.68%)
	Four-Year	14 (42.42%)	7 (21.21%)	9 (27.27%)	3 (9.09%)
Students	Peer Group	4 (22.22%)	7 (38.89%)	6 (33.33%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	26 (41.94%)	18 (29.03%)	17 (27.42%)	0 (0%)
	Four-Year	17 (51.52%)	9 (27.27%)	4 (12.12%)	3 (9.09%)
Governing boards	Peer Group	2 (11.11%)	4 (22.22%)	7 (38.89%)	4 (22.22%)
	Two-Year	14 (22.58%)	12 (19.35%)	26 (41.94%)	9 (14.52%)
	Four-Year	12 (36.36%)	4 (12.12%)	12 (36.36%)	5 (15.15%)
Accreditors (specialized or SACS)	Peer Group	1 (5.56%)	2 (11.11%)	8 (44.44%)	6 (33.33%)
	Two-Year	4 (6.45%)	7 (11.29%)	36 (58.06%)	14 (22.58%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	6 (18.18%)	12 (36.36%)	14 (42.42%)
Government regulatory bodies (state or federal)	Peer Group	1 (5.56%)	3 (16.67%)	6 (33.33%)	7 (38.89%)
	Two-Year	11 (17.74%)	8 (12.9%)	25 (40.32%)	17 (27.42%)
	Four-Year	5 (15.15%)	6 (18.18%)	11 (33.33%)	11 (33.33%)

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to	Occasionally	Frequently
Alumni	Peer Group	7 (38.89%)	6 (33.33%)	4 (22.22%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	44 (70.97%)	11 (17.74%)	6 (9.68%)	0 (0%)
	Four-Year	23 (69.7%)	7 (21.21%)	3 (9.09%)	0 (0%)
General public	Peer Group	5 (27.78%)	5 (27.78%)	6 (33.33%)	1 (5.56%)
	Two-Year	33 (53.23%)	13 (20.97%)	13 (20.97%)	2 (3.23%)
	Four-Year	21 (63.64%)	6 (18.18%)	5 (15.15%)	1 (3.03%)

14) Who makes decisions about changes to general education and/or the core curriculum based on assessment findings?  
(Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	12 (66.67%)	46 (74.19%)	20 (60.61%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	0 (0%)	4 (6.45%)	8 (24.24%)
Academic affairs committee	6 (33.33%)	24 (38.71%)	6 (18.18%)
General education/core curriculum committee	16 (88.89%)	43 (69.35%)	27 (81.82%)
Deans of individual colleges	5 (27.78%)	11 (17.74%)	16 (48.48%)
Department chairs or departmental undergraduate studies committees	6 (33.33%)	31 (50%)	17 (51.52%)
Faculty members	13 (72.22%)	39 (62.9%)	19 (57.58%)

15) To what extent has your institution used general education competencies assessment findings for each of the following?

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Prepare for institutional accreditation	Peer Group	0 (0%)	2 (11.11%)	3 (16.67%)	13 (72.22%)
	Two-Year	2 (3.23%)	6 (9.68%)	16 (25.81%)	38 (61.29%)
	Four-Year	2 (6.06%)	4 (12.12%)	4 (12.12%)	23 (69.7%)
Prepare for specialized accreditation	Peer Group	1 (5.56%)	1 (5.56%)	7 (38.89%)	9 (50%)
	Two-Year	16 (25.81%)	3 (4.84%)	21 (33.87%)	22 (35.48%)
	Four-Year	7 (21.21%)	5 (15.15%)	10 (30.3%)	11 (33.33%)

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Provide data for public accountability (e.g. VSA)	Peer Group	5 (27.78%)	6 (33.33%)	5 (27.78%)	2 (11.11%)
	Two-Year	33 (53.23%)	9 (14.52%)	17 (27.42%)	3 (4.84%)
	Four-Year	5 (15.15%)	3 (9.09%)	5 (15.15%)	20 (60.61%)
Respond to assessment requirements set by THECB and/or governing board	Peer Group	0 (0%)	1 (5.56%)	4 (22.22%)	13 (72.22%)
	Two-Year	2 (3.23%)	6 (9.68%)	22 (35.48%)	32 (51.61%)
	Four-Year	2 (6.06%)	6 (18.18%)	7 (21.21%)	18 (54.55%)
Revise general education competencies	Peer Group	1 (5.56%)	1 (5.56%)	11 (61.11%)	5 (27.78%)
	Two-Year	5 (8.06%)	12 (19.35%)	29 (46.77%)	16 (25.81%)
	Four-Year	4 (12.12%)	13 (39.39%)	9 (27.27%)	7 (21.21%)
Make changes to general education/core curriculum	Peer Group	0 (0%)	2 (11.11%)	10 (55.56%)	6 (33.33%)
	Two-Year	4 (6.45%)	15 (24.19%)	24 (38.71%)	19 (30.65%)
	Four-Year	3 (9.09%)	13 (39.39%)	8 (24.24%)	9 (27.27%)
Refine assessment process and/or measures	Peer Group	0 (0%)	3 (16.67%)	6 (33.33%)	9 (50%)
	Two-Year	5 (8.06%)	16 (25.81%)	16 (25.81%)	25 (40.32%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	11 (33.33%)	17 (51.52%)
Determine student readiness for upper-level coursework	Peer Group	5 (27.78%)	6 (33.33%)	2 (11.11%)	5 (27.78%)
	Two-Year	21 (33.87%)	16 (25.81%)	12 (19.35%)	13 (20.97%)
	Four-Year	18 (54.55%)	9 (27.27%)	4 (12.12%)	2 (6.06%)
Align curricula and/or learning outcomes with K-12 and/or feeder colleges/universities	Peer Group	2 (11.11%)	9 (50%)	5 (27.78%)	2 (11.11%)
	Two-Year	13 (20.97%)	27 (43.55%)	17 (27.42%)	5 (8.06%)
	Four-Year	16 (48.48%)	8 (24.24%)	5 (15.15%)	4 (12.12%)

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Align curricula and/or learning outcomes between general education and major sequence courses	Peer Group	1 (5.56%)	8 (44.44%)	6 (33.33%)	3 (16.67%)
	Two-Year	20 (32.26%)	19 (30.65%)	14 (22.58%)	9 (14.52%)
	Four-Year	12 (36.36%)	11 (33.33%)	6 (18.18%)	4 (12.12%)
Improve teaching (e.g. faculty development programs)	Peer Group	0 (0%)	4 (22.22%)	1 (5.56%)	13 (72.22%)
	Two-Year	3 (4.84%)	15 (24.19%)	19 (30.65%)	25 (40.32%)
	Four-Year	10 (30.3%)	7 (21.21%)	11 (33.33%)	5 (15.15%)
Make decisions about faculty tenure, promotion, or merit raises	Peer Group	16 (88.89%)	1 (5.56%)	0 (0%)	1 (5.56%)
	Two-Year	53 (85.48%)	4 (6.45%)	4 (6.45%)	1 (1.61%)
	Four-Year	29 (87.88%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	0 (0%)
Allocate resources to departments	Peer Group	10 (55.56%)	2 (11.11%)	5 (27.78%)	1 (5.56%)
	Two-Year	41 (66.13%)	10 (16.13%)	9 (14.52%)	2 (3.23%)
	Four-Year	26 (78.79%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	3 (9.09%)
Recruit prospective students	Peer Group	14 (77.78%)	2 (11.11%)	2 (11.11%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	53 (85.48%)	4 (6.45%)	5 (8.06%)	0 (0%)
	Four-Year	27 (81.82%)	4 (12.12%)	2 (6.06%)	0 (0%)
Make decisions related to strategic planning	Peer Group	0 (0%)	5 (27.78%)	7 (38.89%)	6 (33.33%)
	Two-Year	6 (9.68%)	14 (22.58%)	25 (40.32%)	17 (27.42%)
	Four-Year	11 (33.33%)	9 (27.27%)	8 (24.24%)	5 (15.15%)

16) Has your institution made any recent changes to general education and/or the core curriculum as a result of the assessment process?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	7 (38.89%)	24 (38.71%)	11 (33.33%)
No	3 (16.67%)	21 (33.87%)	13 (39.39%)
In Process	7 (38.89%)	15 (24.19%)	9 (27.27%)

16a) (If yes or in process) Please briefly describe the changes to general education and/or the core curriculum and the reasons for making them.

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (39)	Four-Year Institutions (20)
Defined new general education competencies	1 (7.14%)	1 (2.56%)	5 (25%)
Mapped general education competencies to curriculum	2 (14.29%)	3 (7.69%)	2 (10%)
Reduced number of hours in core curriculum	2 (14.29%)	2 (5.13%)	2 (10%)
Added/dropped general education requirements	1 (7.14%)	6 (15.38%)	2 (10%)
Dropped excess general education courses/streamlined core	0 (0%)	4 (10.26%)	1 (5%)
Added/dropped courses based on coverage of general education competencies	3 (21.43%)	5 (12.82%)	5 (25%)
Changed general education course content	0 (0%)	6 (15.38%)	7 (35%)
Changed general education assessment plan	0 (0%)	7 (17.95%)	5 (25%)



# General Education Assessment Practices Survey 2009

## Large Community Colleges Accountability Peer Group Responses

Number of responses from peer group: 7

### Structure of and Resources for General Education Assessment

- 1) Which offices and/or groups are responsible for the following aspects of assessing general education competencies at your institution? (Choose all that apply)

Peer Group	Selecting Assessment Methods	Developing Assessment Instruments	Collecting & Analyzing Data	Reviewing Assessment Findings	Other Assessment Work
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	2 (28.57%)	2 (28.57%)	0 (0%)	5 (71.43%)	0 (0%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	1 (14.29%)	2 (28.57%)	2 (28.57%)	4 (57.14%)	3 (42.86%)
Office of Institutional Research	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	3 (42.86%)	2 (28.57%)	3 (42.86%)
General education assessment committee	2 (28.57%)	2 (28.57%)	3 (42.86%)	3 (42.86%)	2 (28.57%)
Faculty members	6 (85.71%)	6 (85.71%)	2 (28.57%)	5 (71.43%)	1 (14.29%)
Deans/Division Chairs/Dept. Chairs	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)	2 (28.57%)	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)

All Two-Year Institutions (62)	Selecting Assessment Methods	Developing Assessment Instruments	Collecting & Analyzing Data	Reviewing Assessment Findings	Other Assessment Work
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	32 (51.61%)	19 (30.65%)	19 (30.65%)	49 (79.03%)	18 (29.03%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	3 (4.84%)	2 (3.23%)	2 (3.23%)	6 (9.68%)	1 (1.61%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	18 (29.03%)	21 (33.87%)	29 (46.77%)	29 (46.77%)	17 (27.42%)
Office of Institutional Research	17 (27.42%)	23 (37.1%)	37 (59.68%)	29 (46.77%)	23 (37.1%)
General education assessment committee	25 (40.32%)	23 (37.1%)	27 (43.55%)	30 (48.39%)	12 (19.35%)
Faculty members	47 (75.81%)	52 (83.87%)	39 (62.9%)	44 (70.97%)	16 (25.81%)
Deans/Division Chairs/Dept. Chairs	8 (12.9%)	6 (9.68%)	8 (12.9%)	6 (9.68%)	3 (4.84%)

All Four-Year Institutions (33)	Selecting Assessment Methods	Developing Assessment Instruments	Collecting & Analyzing Data	Reviewing Assessment Findings	Other Assessment Work
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	13 (39.39%)	9 (27.27%)	7 (21.21%)	23 (69.7%)	12 (36.36%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	8 (24.24%)	6 (18.18%)	5 (15.15%)	10 (30.3%)	7 (21.21%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	14 (42.42%)	14 (42.42%)	20 (60.61%)	22 (66.67%)	14 (42.42%)
Office of Institutional Research	7 (21.21%)	12 (36.36%)	19 (57.58%)	11 (33.33%)	13 (39.39%)
General education assessment committee	17 (51.52%)	15 (45.45%)	14 (42.42%)	21 (63.64%)	10 (30.3%)
Faculty members	23 (69.7%)	27 (81.82%)	24 (72.73%)	24 (72.73%)	12 (36.36%)
Deans/Division Chairs/Dept. Chairs	1 (3.03%)	1 (3.03%)	2 (6.06%)	4 (12.12%)	2 (6.06%)

2) Please briefly describe the process through which your institution assesses general education competencies.

See attached list of responses

3) Does your institution have one or more staff positions whose primary focus is learning assessment?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	5 (71.43%)	21 (33.87%)	26 (78.79%)
No	2 (28.57%)	41 (66.13%)	7 (21.21%)

3a) (If yes) In what office or offices is this position or positions located? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (21)	Four-Year Institutions (26)
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	1 (20%)	9 (42.86%)	12 (46.15%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (11.54%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	4 (80%)	10 (47.62%)	17 (65.38%)
Office of Institutional Research	3 (60%)	7 (33.33%)	10 (38.46%)
Academic colleges or departments	1 (20%)	1 (4.76%)	5 (19.23%)

4) What resources are available at your institution to support assessment of general education competencies? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Assessment training for faculty or staff as part of formal professional development activities (e.g. in-service sessions, orientation for new faculty)	5 (71.43%)	44 (70.97%)	19 (57.58%)
Optional assessment workshops for faculty or staff	6 (85.71%)	40 (64.52%)	26 (78.79%)
One-on-one consultation with faculty	4 (57.14%)	44 (70.97%)	30 (90.91%)
Funding for faculty or staff to attend assessment conferences or training	6 (85.71%)	53 (85.48%)	27 (81.82%)
Funding or release time for faculty or staff to work on assessment	4 (57.14%)	22 (35.48%)	9 (27.27%)
Books/reference materials on assessment distributed to faculty or staff	6 (85.71%)	44 (70.97%)	23 (69.7%)

5) Does your institution use centralized software for assessment data collection and reporting?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	4 (57.14%)	23 (37.1%)	22 (66.67%)
No	1 (14.29%)	23 (37.1%)	7 (21.21%)
In Process	2 (28.57%)	16 (25.81%)	4 (12.12%)

5a) (If yes or in process) Which software package do you use or plan to use? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (39)	Four-Year Institutions (26)
Blackboard	0 (0%)	6 (15.38%)	7 (26.92%)
Datatel	0 (0%)	3 (7.69%)	1 (3.85%)
Strategic Planning Online (SPOL)	0 (0%)	8 (20.51%)	1 (3.85%)
Task Stream	1 (16.67%)	2 (5.13%)	4 (15.38%)
Tk20	1 (16.67%)	1 (2.56%)	1 (3.85%)
TracDat	2 (33.33%)	5 (12.82%)	5 (19.23%)
Weave Online	1 (16.67%)	8 (20.51%)	8 (30.77%)
Locally-developed software	1 (16.67%)	9 (23.08%)	5 (19.23%)
OATS	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (7.69%)
Banner	0 (0%)	1 (2.08%)	1 (3.85%)
Other	0 (0%)	7 (14.58%)	3 (11.54%)

5b) (If yes or in process) How long have you been using this software package?

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (39)	Four-Year Institutions (26)
In process of adopting	1 (16.67%)	8 (20.51%)	3 (11.54%)
Less than 1 year	1 (16.67%)	8 (20.51%)	9 (34.62%)
Between 1 and 3 years	1 (16.67%)	5 (12.82%)	3 (11.54%)
3 years	2 (33.33%)	5 (12.82%)	6 (23.08%)
4 or more years	0 (0%)	3 (7.69%)	4 (15.38%)
Use multiple programs	0 (0%)	5 (12.82%)	1 (3.85%)

**General Education Assessment Practices**

6) What is the cycle on which your institution assesses all general education competencies and reviews the assessment findings (recognizing that specific competencies may be assessed on a more frequent schedule)?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Every semester	0 (0%)	9 (14.52%)	3 (9.09%)
Every year	5 (71.43%)	25 (40.32%)	12 (36.36%)
Every two years	0 (0%)	6 (9.68%)	4 (12.12%)
Every 2-3 years	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.06%)
Every three years or beyond	2 (28.57%)	18 (29.03%)	7 (21.21%)
In process of determining	0 (0%)	2 (3.23%)	3 (9.09%)

7) Does your institution use general knowledge and skills exams to assess general education competencies (e.g. CAAP, CLA, MAPP)?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	0 (0%)	17 (27.42%)	29 (87.88%)
No	7 (100%)	41 (66.13%)	1 (3.03%)
In Process	0 (0%)	4 (6.45%)	3 (9.09%)

7a) (If yes) Which standardized exam(s) is/are used to measure general education competencies at your institution? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (21)	Four-Year Institutions (32)
CAAP	0 (0%)	9 (42.86%)	7 (21.88%)
CBASE	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.13%)
CCTST	0 (0%)	1 (4.76%)	1 (3.13%)
CLA	0 (0%)	2 (9.52%)	15 (46.88%)
MAPP	0 (0%)	7 (33.33%)	11 (34.38%)
WorkKeys	0 (0%)	2 (9.52%)	0 (0%)
Institutionally-developed exam	0 (0%)	2 (9.52%)	3 (9.38%)
NSF Critical Thinking Assessment	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.13%)

7b) (If yes) Which students at your institution take the general knowledge and skills exam(s)? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (21)	Four-Year Institutions (32)
All students completing general education and/or core curriculum (e.g. rising junior exam)	0 (0%)	3 (14.29%)	1 (3.13%)
All graduating students	0 (0%)	1 (4.76%)	1 (3.13%)
A sample of students completing general education and/or core curriculum	0 (0%)	11 (52.38%)	5 (15.63%)
A sample of graduating students	0 (0%)	4 (19.05%)	4 (12.5%)
A sample of first-year and senior students	0 (0%)	2 (9.52%)	23 (71.88%)

8) Which methods of assessing general education competencies are used at your institution and to what extent?

	Institutional Type	Never Used	Used in Past But Not Now	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Course grades in general education and/or core curriculum classes	Peer Group	3 (42.86%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	3 (42.86%)
	Two-Year	16 (25.81%)	12 (19.35%)	2 (3.23%)	11 (17.74%)	21 (33.87%)
	Four-Year	24 (72.73%)	4 (12.12%)	1 (3.03%)	1 (3.03%)	3 (9.09%)
Course grades in more advanced classes that build on general education and/or core curriculum classes	Peer Group	4 (57.14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	2 (28.57%)
	Two-Year	33 (53.23%)	2 (3.23%)	5 (8.06%)	13 (20.97%)	9 (14.52%)
	Four-Year	27 (81.82%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	1 (3.03%)	1 (3.03%)

	Institutional Type	Never Used	Used in Past But Not Now	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Student work from individual course sections (e.g. quizzes, exams, essays, research papers)	Peer Group	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)	4 (57.14%)
	Two-Year	1 (1.61%)	1 (1.61%)	5 (8.06%)	13 (20.97%)	42 (67.74%)
	Four-Year	4 (12.12%)	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	4 (12.12%)	20 (60.61%)
Common exams, exam questions, assignments, and/or grading rubrics to assess student work across course sections	Peer Group	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)	4 (57.14%)
	Two-Year	3 (4.84%)	0 (0%)	6 (9.68%)	18 (29.03%)	35 (56.45%)
	Four-Year	2 (6.06%)	0 (0%)	4 (12.12%)	7 (21.21%)	20 (60.61%)
Observations of student performance (e.g. simulations, labs, recitals)	Peer Group	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)	3 (42.86%)
	Two-Year	6 (9.68%)	0 (0%)	6 (9.68%)	29 (46.77%)	21 (33.87%)
	Four-Year	4 (12.12%)	0 (0%)	7 (21.21%)	13 (39.39%)	9 (27.27%)
Cumulative assessments (e.g. capstone projects, portfolios)	Peer Group	3 (42.86%)	0 (0%)	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)
	Two-Year	14 (22.58%)	0 (0%)	10 (16.13%)	21 (33.87%)	17 (27.42%)
	Four-Year	6 (18.18%)	0 (0%)	9 (27.27%)	13 (39.39%)	5 (15.15%)
Student surveys (e.g. NSSE/CCSSE, CIRP surveys, locally-developed surveys)	Peer Group	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (42.86%)	3 (42.86%)
	Two-Year	7 (11.29%)	2 (3.23%)	4 (6.45%)	18 (29.03%)	31 (50%)
	Four-Year	5 (15.15%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.03%)	6 (18.18%)	21 (63.64%)
Faculty surveys	Peer Group	3 (42.86%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)
	Two-Year	29 (46.77%)	1 (1.61%)	9 (14.52%)	17 (27.42%)	6 (9.68%)
	Four-Year	19 (57.58%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.03%)	9 (27.27%)	4 (12.12%)
Alumni or graduate surveys	Peer Group	2 (28.57%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (42.86%)	2 (28.57%)
	Two-Year	24 (38.71%)	3 (4.84%)	4 (6.45%)	20 (32.26%)	11 (17.74%)
	Four-Year	7 (21.21%)	3 (9.09%)	5 (15.15%)	7 (21.21%)	11 (33.33%)



	Institutional Type	Never Used	Used in Past But Not Now	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Employer surveys or advisory groups	Peer Group	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (85.71%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	19 (30.65%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.61%)	26 (41.94%)	16 (25.81%)
	Four-Year	12 (36.36%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	13 (39.39%)	4 (12.12%)
Student focus groups	Peer Group	4 (57.14%)	0 (0%)	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	27 (43.55%)	3 (4.84%)	10 (16.13%)	18 (29.03%)	4 (6.45%)
	Four-Year	20 (60.61%)	0 (0%)	7 (21.21%)	6 (18.18%)	0 (0%)
Student success measures (e.g. transfer rates, graduation rates, etc.)	Peer Group	3 (42.86%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)	3 (42.86%)
	Two-Year	13 (20.97%)	0 (0%)	3 (4.84%)	9 (14.52%)	37 (59.68%)
	Four-Year	17 (51.52%)	0 (0%)	3 (9.09%)	6 (18.18%)	7 (21.21%)
Data on student performance after transfer or graduation	Peer Group	3 (42.86%)	0 (0%)	2 (28.57%)	2 (28.57%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	14 (22.58%)	0 (0%)	8 (12.9%)	27 (43.55%)	13 (20.97%)
	Four-Year	20 (60.61%)	0 (0%)	5 (15.15%)	5 (15.15%)	3 (9.09%)

9) What strategies are used to involve students in the general education assessment process at your institution? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Course-embedded assessments	7 (100%)	61 (98.39%)	28 (84.85%)
In-class administration of a standardized exam	2 (28.57%)	35 (56.45%)	17 (51.52%)
Participation in assessment is required outside of class	0 (0%)	8 (12.9%)	8 (24.24%)
Educational/outreach efforts (e.g. explaining the importance of assessment)	0 (0%)	14 (22.58%)	11 (33.33%)
Monetary incentives	0 (0%)	6 (9.68%)	16 (48.48%)
Non-monetary rewards (e.g. event tickets, prize drawings, etc.)	0 (0%)	5 (8.06%)	12 (36.36%)

9a) Which of these strategies (if any) do you find to be most effective?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Course-embedded and in-class assessments	4 (57.14%)	44 (70.97%)	24 (72.73%)
External rewards (monetary or non-monetary)	0 (0%)	1 (1.61%)	9 (27.27%)
Required participation	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.06%)
Educational/outreach efforts	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (9.09%)
Academic incentives (e.g. bonus points)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.06%)

10) Which of the following options would be most helpful in improving general education assessment practices at your institution? (Choose 3)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
More faculty involvement	3 (42.86%)	28 (45.16%)	18 (54.55%)
More student involvement	1 (14.29%)	8 (12.9%)	5 (15.15%)
Emphasis on assessment by institutional leaders	2 (28.57%)	9 (14.52%)	10 (30.3%)
Including student learning in the institutional strategic plan	0 (0%)	5 (8.06%)	3 (9.09%)
Additional faculty or staff expertise in assessment methods	3 (42.86%)	33 (53.23%)	18 (54.55%)
Better ways to measure student learning outcomes	1 (14.29%)	23 (37.1%)	10 (30.3%)
Additional resources (e.g. staff, funding)	2 (28.57%)	28 (45.16%)	13 (39.39%)
Information about practices and policies at peer institutions	3 (42.86%)	15 (24.19%)	9 (27.27%)
Agreement on general education/core curriculum learning outcomes throughout the state	3 (42.86%)	26 (41.94%)	9 (27.27%)

11) Please describe one or two practices used by your institution to assess general education competencies that you consider to be working well.

See attached list of responses

12) Please describe one or two significant challenges that your institution faces in assessing general education competencies.

See attached list of responses

**Use of General Education Assessment Findings**

13) With whom and how frequently are institutional-level reports on general education assessment findings shared?

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to	Occasionally	Frequently
Academic administrators	Peer Group	0 (0%)	3 (42.86%)	3 (42.86%)	1 (14.29%)
	Two-Year	3 (4.84%)	7 (11.29%)	16 (25.81%)	35 (56.45%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	9 (27.27%)	19 (57.58%)
Faculty	Peer Group	0 (0%)	2 (28.57%)	5 (71.43%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	2 (3.23%)	7 (11.29%)	24 (38.71%)	28 (45.16%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	15 (45.45%)	13 (39.39%)
Staff	Peer Group	5 (71.43%)	2 (28.57%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	24 (38.71%)	10 (16.13%)	21 (33.87%)	6 (9.68%)
	Four-Year	14 (42.42%)	7 (21.21%)	9 (27.27%)	3 (9.09%)
Students	Peer Group	6 (85.71%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	26 (41.94%)	18 (29.03%)	17 (27.42%)	0 (0%)
	Four-Year	17 (51.52%)	9 (27.27%)	4 (12.12%)	3 (9.09%)
Governing boards	Peer Group	1 (14.29%)	3 (42.86%)	3 (42.86%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	14 (22.58%)	12 (19.35%)	26 (41.94%)	9 (14.52%)
	Four-Year	12 (36.36%)	4 (12.12%)	12 (36.36%)	5 (15.15%)
Accreditors (specialized or SACS)	Peer Group	0 (0%)	2 (28.57%)	4 (57.14%)	1 (14.29%)
	Two-Year	4 (6.45%)	7 (11.29%)	36 (58.06%)	14 (22.58%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	6 (18.18%)	12 (36.36%)	14 (42.42%)
Government regulatory bodies (state or federal)	Peer Group	3 (42.86%)	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)	2 (28.57%)
	Two-Year	11 (17.74%)	8 (12.9%)	25 (40.32%)	17 (27.42%)
	Four-Year	5 (15.15%)	6 (18.18%)	11 (33.33%)	11 (33.33%)

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to	Occasionally	Frequently
Alumni	Peer Group	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	44 (70.97%)	11 (17.74%)	6 (9.68%)	0 (0%)
	Four-Year	23 (69.7%)	7 (21.21%)	3 (9.09%)	0 (0%)
General public	Peer Group	6 (85.71%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	33 (53.23%)	13 (20.97%)	13 (20.97%)	2 (3.23%)
	Four-Year	21 (63.64%)	6 (18.18%)	5 (15.15%)	1 (3.03%)

14) Who makes decisions about changes to general education and/or the core curriculum based on assessment findings?  
(Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	7 (100%)	46 (74.19%)	20 (60.61%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	0 (0%)	4 (6.45%)	8 (24.24%)
Academic affairs committee	4 (57.14%)	24 (38.71%)	6 (18.18%)
General education/core curriculum committee	4 (57.14%)	43 (69.35%)	27 (81.82%)
Deans of individual colleges	1 (14.29%)	11 (17.74%)	16 (48.48%)
Department chairs or departmental undergraduate studies committees	4 (57.14%)	31 (50%)	17 (51.52%)
Faculty members	4 (57.14%)	39 (62.9%)	19 (57.58%)

15) To what extent has your institution used general education competencies assessment findings for each of the following?

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Prepare for institutional accreditation	Peer Group	0 (0%)	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)	4 (57.14%)
	Two-Year	2 (3.23%)	6 (9.68%)	16 (25.81%)	38 (61.29%)
	Four-Year	2 (6.06%)	4 (12.12%)	4 (12.12%)	23 (69.7%)
Prepare for specialized accreditation	Peer Group	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)	3 (42.86%)	1 (14.29%)
	Two-Year	16 (25.81%)	3 (4.84%)	21 (33.87%)	22 (35.48%)
	Four-Year	7 (21.21%)	5 (15.15%)	10 (30.3%)	11 (33.33%)

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Provide data for public accountability (e.g. VSA)	Peer Group	5 (71.43%)	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	33 (53.23%)	9 (14.52%)	17 (27.42%)	3 (4.84%)
	Four-Year	5 (15.15%)	3 (9.09%)	5 (15.15%)	20 (60.61%)
Respond to assessment requirements set by THECB and/or governing board	Peer Group	0 (0%)	1 (14.29%)	3 (42.86%)	3 (42.86%)
	Two-Year	2 (3.23%)	6 (9.68%)	22 (35.48%)	32 (51.61%)
	Four-Year	2 (6.06%)	6 (18.18%)	7 (21.21%)	18 (54.55%)
Revise general education competencies	Peer Group	0 (0%)	3 (42.86%)	2 (28.57%)	2 (28.57%)
	Two-Year	5 (8.06%)	12 (19.35%)	29 (46.77%)	16 (25.81%)
	Four-Year	4 (12.12%)	13 (39.39%)	9 (27.27%)	7 (21.21%)
Make changes to general education/core curriculum	Peer Group	1 (14.29%)	4 (57.14%)	0 (0%)	2 (28.57%)
	Two-Year	4 (6.45%)	15 (24.19%)	24 (38.71%)	19 (30.65%)
	Four-Year	3 (9.09%)	13 (39.39%)	8 (24.24%)	9 (27.27%)
Refine assessment process and/or measures	Peer Group	2 (28.57%)	4 (57.14%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	5 (8.06%)	16 (25.81%)	16 (25.81%)	25 (40.32%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	11 (33.33%)	17 (51.52%)
Determine student readiness for upper-level coursework	Peer Group	4 (57.14%)	2 (28.57%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	21 (33.87%)	16 (25.81%)	12 (19.35%)	13 (20.97%)
	Four-Year	18 (54.55%)	9 (27.27%)	4 (12.12%)	2 (6.06%)
Align curricula and/or learning outcomes with K-12 and/or feeder colleges/universities	Peer Group	3 (42.86%)	4 (57.14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	13 (20.97%)	27 (43.55%)	17 (27.42%)	5 (8.06%)
	Four-Year	16 (48.48%)	8 (24.24%)	5 (15.15%)	4 (12.12%)

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Align curricula and/or learning outcomes between general education and major sequence courses	Peer Group	3 (42.86%)	4 (57.14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	20 (32.26%)	19 (30.65%)	14 (22.58%)	9 (14.52%)
	Four-Year	12 (36.36%)	11 (33.33%)	6 (18.18%)	4 (12.12%)
Improve teaching (e.g. faculty development programs)	Peer Group	1 (14.29%)	5 (71.43%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	3 (4.84%)	15 (24.19%)	19 (30.65%)	25 (40.32%)
	Four-Year	10 (30.3%)	7 (21.21%)	11 (33.33%)	5 (15.15%)
Make decisions about faculty tenure, promotion, or merit raises	Peer Group	5 (71.43%)	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	53 (85.48%)	4 (6.45%)	4 (6.45%)	1 (1.61%)
	Four-Year	29 (87.88%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	0 (0%)
Allocate resources to departments	Peer Group	4 (57.14%)	3 (42.86%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	41 (66.13%)	10 (16.13%)	9 (14.52%)	2 (3.23%)
	Four-Year	26 (78.79%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	3 (9.09%)
Recruit prospective students	Peer Group	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	53 (85.48%)	4 (6.45%)	5 (8.06%)	0 (0%)
	Four-Year	27 (81.82%)	4 (12.12%)	2 (6.06%)	0 (0%)
Make decisions related to strategic planning	Peer Group	1 (14.29%)	2 (28.57%)	3 (42.86%)	1 (14.29%)
	Two-Year	6 (9.68%)	14 (22.58%)	25 (40.32%)	17 (27.42%)
	Four-Year	11 (33.33%)	9 (27.27%)	8 (24.24%)	5 (15.15%)

16) Has your institution made any recent changes to general education and/or the core curriculum as a result of the assessment process?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	1 (14.29%)	24 (38.71%)	11 (33.33%)
No	5 (71.43%)	21 (33.87%)	13 (39.39%)
In Process	1 (14.29%)	15 (24.19%)	9 (27.27%)

16a) (If yes or in process) Please briefly describe the changes to general education and/or the core curriculum and the reasons for making them.

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (39)	Four-Year Institutions (20)
Defined new general education competencies	0 (0%)	1 (2.56%)	5 (25%)
Mapped general education competencies to curriculum	0 (0%)	3 (7.69%)	2 (10%)
Reduced number of hours in core curriculum	0 (0%)	2 (5.13%)	2 (10%)
Added/dropped general education requirements	0 (0%)	6 (15.38%)	2 (10%)
Dropped excess general education courses/streamlined core	1 (50%)	4 (10.26%)	1 (5%)
Added/dropped courses based on coverage of general education competencies	0 (0%)	5 (12.82%)	5 (25%)
Changed general education course content	0 (0%)	6 (15.38%)	7 (35%)
Changed general education assessment plan	0 (0%)	7 (17.95%)	5 (25%)



# General Education Assessment Practices Survey 2009

## Medium Community Colleges Accountability Peer Group Responses

Number of responses from peer group: 21

### Structure of and Resources for General Education Assessment

- 1) Which offices and/or groups are responsible for the following aspects of assessing general education competencies at your institution? (Choose all that apply)

Peer Group	Selecting Assessment Methods	Developing Assessment Instruments	Collecting & Analyzing Data	Reviewing Assessment Findings	Other Assessment Work
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	10 (47.62%)	6 (28.57%)	8 (38.1%)	17 (80.95%)	6 (28.57%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	1 (4.76%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (9.52%)	0 (0%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	7 (33.33%)	8 (38.1%)	11 (52.38%)	9 (42.86%)	4 (19.05%)
Office of Institutional Research	3 (14.29%)	6 (28.57%)	10 (47.62%)	8 (38.1%)	7 (33.33%)
General education assessment committee	5 (23.81%)	3 (14.29%)	9 (42.86%)	9 (42.86%)	3 (14.29%)
Faculty members	17 (80.95%)	20 (95.24%)	16 (76.19%)	15 (71.43%)	5 (23.81%)
Deans/Division Chairs/Dept. Chairs	4 (19.05%)	4 (19.05%)	4 (19.05%)	2 (9.52%)	1 (4.76%)

All Two-Year Institutions (62)	Selecting Assessment Methods	Developing Assessment Instruments	Collecting & Analyzing Data	Reviewing Assessment Findings	Other Assessment Work
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	32 (51.61%)	19 (30.65%)	19 (30.65%)	49 (79.03%)	18 (29.03%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	3 (4.84%)	2 (3.23%)	2 (3.23%)	6 (9.68%)	1 (1.61%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	18 (29.03%)	21 (33.87%)	29 (46.77%)	29 (46.77%)	17 (27.42%)
Office of Institutional Research	17 (27.42%)	23 (37.1%)	37 (59.68%)	29 (46.77%)	23 (37.1%)
General education assessment committee	25 (40.32%)	23 (37.1%)	27 (43.55%)	30 (48.39%)	12 (19.35%)
Faculty members	47 (75.81%)	52 (83.87%)	39 (62.9%)	44 (70.97%)	16 (25.81%)
Deans/Division Chairs/Dept. Chairs	8 (12.9%)	6 (9.68%)	8 (12.9%)	6 (9.68%)	3 (4.84%)

All Four-Year Institutions (33)	Selecting Assessment Methods	Developing Assessment Instruments	Collecting & Analyzing Data	Reviewing Assessment Findings	Other Assessment Work
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	13 (39.39%)	9 (27.27%)	7 (21.21%)	23 (69.7%)	12 (36.36%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	8 (24.24%)	6 (18.18%)	5 (15.15%)	10 (30.3%)	7 (21.21%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	14 (42.42%)	14 (42.42%)	20 (60.61%)	22 (66.67%)	14 (42.42%)
Office of Institutional Research	7 (21.21%)	12 (36.36%)	19 (57.58%)	11 (33.33%)	13 (39.39%)
General education assessment committee	17 (51.52%)	15 (45.45%)	14 (42.42%)	21 (63.64%)	10 (30.3%)
Faculty members	23 (69.7%)	27 (81.82%)	24 (72.73%)	24 (72.73%)	12 (36.36%)
Deans/Division Chairs/Dept. Chairs	1 (3.03%)	1 (3.03%)	2 (6.06%)	4 (12.12%)	2 (6.06%)

2) Please briefly describe the process through which your institution assesses general education competencies.

See attached list of responses

3) Does your institution have one or more staff positions whose primary focus is learning assessment?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	3 (14.29%)	21 (33.87%)	26 (78.79%)
No	18 (85.71%)	41 (66.13%)	7 (21.21%)

3a) (If yes) In what office or offices is this position or positions located? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (21)	Four-Year Institutions (26)
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	1 (33.33%)	9 (42.86%)	12 (46.15%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (11.54%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	3 (100%)	10 (47.62%)	17 (65.38%)
Office of Institutional Research	1 (33.33%)	7 (33.33%)	10 (38.46%)
Academic colleges or departments	0 (0%)	1 (4.76%)	5 (19.23%)

4) What resources are available at your institution to support assessment of general education competencies? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Assessment training for faculty or staff as part of formal professional development activities (e.g. in-service sessions, orientation for new faculty)	11 (52.38%)	44 (70.97%)	19 (57.58%)
Optional assessment workshops for faculty or staff	13 (61.9%)	40 (64.52%)	26 (78.79%)
One-on-one consultation with faculty	14 (66.67%)	44 (70.97%)	30 (90.91%)
Funding for faculty or staff to attend assessment conferences or training	18 (85.71%)	53 (85.48%)	27 (81.82%)
Funding or release time for faculty or staff to work on assessment	3 (14.29%)	22 (35.48%)	9 (27.27%)
Books/reference materials on assessment distributed to faculty or staff	16 (76.19%)	44 (70.97%)	23 (69.7%)

5) Does your institution use centralized software for assessment data collection and reporting?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	7 (33.33%)	23 (37.1%)	22 (66.67%)
No	9 (42.86%)	23 (37.1%)	7 (21.21%)
In Process	5 (23.81%)	16 (25.81%)	4 (12.12%)

5a) (If yes or in process) Which software package do you use or plan to use? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (39)	Four-Year Institutions (26)
Blackboard	1 (8.33%)	6 (15.38%)	7 (26.92%)
Datatel	1 (8.33%)	3 (7.69%)	1 (3.85%)
Strategic Planning Online (SPOL)	1 (8.33%)	8 (20.51%)	1 (3.85%)
Task Stream	0 (0%)	2 (5.13%)	4 (15.38%)
Tk20	0 (0%)	1 (2.56%)	1 (3.85%)
TracDat	1 (8.33%)	5 (12.82%)	5 (19.23%)
Weave Online	3 (25%)	8 (20.51%)	8 (30.77%)
Locally-developed software	3 (25%)	9 (23.08%)	5 (19.23%)
OATS	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (7.69%)
Banner	1 (8.33%)	1 (2.08%)	1 (3.85%)
Other	3 (25%)	7 (14.58%)	3 (11.54%)

5b) (If yes or in process) How long have you been using this software package?

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (39)	Four-Year Institutions (26)
In process of adopting	2 (16.67%)	8 (20.51%)	3 (11.54%)
Less than 1 year	3 (25%)	8 (20.51%)	9 (34.62%)
Between 1 and 3 years	1 (8.33%)	5 (12.82%)	3 (11.54%)
3 years	2 (16.67%)	5 (12.82%)	6 (23.08%)
4 or more years	1 (8.33%)	3 (7.69%)	4 (15.38%)
Use multiple programs	1 (8.33%)	5 (12.82%)	1 (3.85%)

**General Education Assessment Practices**

6) What is the cycle on which your institution assesses all general education competencies and reviews the assessment findings (recognizing that specific competencies may be assessed on a more frequent schedule)?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Every semester	2 (9.52%)	9 (14.52%)	3 (9.09%)
Every year	10 (47.62%)	25 (40.32%)	12 (36.36%)
Every two years	1 (4.76%)	6 (9.68%)	4 (12.12%)
Every 2-3 years	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.06%)
Every three years or beyond	7 (33.33%)	18 (29.03%)	7 (21.21%)
In process of determining	1 (4.76%)	2 (3.23%)	3 (9.09%)

7) Does your institution use general knowledge and skills exams to assess general education competencies (e.g. CAAP, CLA, MAPP)?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	5 (23.81%)	17 (27.42%)	29 (87.88%)
No	15 (71.43%)	41 (66.13%)	1 (3.03%)
In Process	1 (4.76%)	4 (6.45%)	3 (9.09%)

7a) (If yes) Which standardized exam(s) is/are used to measure general education competencies at your institution? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (21)	Four-Year Institutions (32)
CAAP	3 (50%)	9 (42.86%)	7 (21.88%)
CBASE	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.13%)
CCTST	0 (0%)	1 (4.76%)	1 (3.13%)
CLA	0 (0%)	2 (9.52%)	15 (46.88%)
MAPP	3 (50%)	7 (33.33%)	11 (34.38%)
WorkKeys	0 (0%)	2 (9.52%)	0 (0%)
Institutionally-developed exam	0 (0%)	2 (9.52%)	3 (9.38%)
NSF Critical Thinking Assessment	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.13%)

7b) (If yes) Which students at your institution take the general knowledge and skills exam(s)? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (21)	Four-Year Institutions (32)
All students completing general education and/or core curriculum (e.g. rising junior exam)	0 (0%)	3 (14.29%)	1 (3.13%)
All graduating students	0 (0%)	1 (4.76%)	1 (3.13%)
A sample of students completing general education and/or core curriculum	4 (66.67%)	11 (52.38%)	5 (15.63%)
A sample of graduating students	1 (16.67%)	4 (19.05%)	4 (12.5%)
A sample of first-year and senior students	0 (0%)	2 (9.52%)	23 (71.88%)

8) Which methods of assessing general education competencies are used at your institution and to what extent?

	Institutional Type	Never Used	Used in Past But Not Now	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Course grades in general education and/or core curriculum classes	Peer Group	5 (23.81%)	4 (19.05%)	0 (0%)	6 (28.57%)	6 (28.57%)
	Two-Year	16 (25.81%)	12 (19.35%)	2 (3.23%)	11 (17.74%)	21 (33.87%)
	Four-Year	24 (72.73%)	4 (12.12%)	1 (3.03%)	1 (3.03%)	3 (9.09%)
Course grades in more advanced classes that build on general education and/or core curriculum classes	Peer Group	13 (61.9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (38.1%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	33 (53.23%)	2 (3.23%)	5 (8.06%)	13 (20.97%)	9 (14.52%)
	Four-Year	27 (81.82%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	1 (3.03%)	1 (3.03%)

	Institutional Type	Never Used	Used in Past But Not Now	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Student work from individual course sections (e.g. quizzes, exams, essays, research papers)	Peer Group	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (4.76%)	6 (28.57%)	14 (66.67%)
	Two-Year	1 (1.61%)	1 (1.61%)	5 (8.06%)	13 (20.97%)	42 (67.74%)
	Four-Year	4 (12.12%)	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	4 (12.12%)	20 (60.61%)
Common exams, exam questions, assignments, and/or grading rubrics to assess student work across course sections	Peer Group	1 (4.76%)	0 (0%)	1 (4.76%)	7 (33.33%)	12 (57.14%)
	Two-Year	3 (4.84%)	0 (0%)	6 (9.68%)	18 (29.03%)	35 (56.45%)
	Four-Year	2 (6.06%)	0 (0%)	4 (12.12%)	7 (21.21%)	20 (60.61%)
Observations of student performance (e.g. simulations, labs, recitals)	Peer Group	2 (9.52%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	11 (52.38%)	8 (38.1%)
	Two-Year	6 (9.68%)	0 (0%)	6 (9.68%)	29 (46.77%)	21 (33.87%)
	Four-Year	4 (12.12%)	0 (0%)	7 (21.21%)	13 (39.39%)	9 (27.27%)
Cumulative assessments (e.g. capstone projects, portfolios)	Peer Group	8 (38.1%)	0 (0%)	3 (14.29%)	8 (38.1%)	2 (9.52%)
	Two-Year	14 (22.58%)	0 (0%)	10 (16.13%)	21 (33.87%)	17 (27.42%)
	Four-Year	6 (18.18%)	0 (0%)	9 (27.27%)	13 (39.39%)	5 (15.15%)
Student surveys (e.g. NSSE/CCSSE, CIRP surveys, locally-developed surveys)	Peer Group	3 (14.29%)	0 (0%)	1 (4.76%)	7 (33.33%)	10 (47.62%)
	Two-Year	7 (11.29%)	2 (3.23%)	4 (6.45%)	18 (29.03%)	31 (50%)
	Four-Year	5 (15.15%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.03%)	6 (18.18%)	21 (63.64%)
Faculty surveys	Peer Group	8 (38.1%)	0 (0%)	5 (23.81%)	6 (28.57%)	2 (9.52%)
	Two-Year	29 (46.77%)	1 (1.61%)	9 (14.52%)	17 (27.42%)	6 (9.68%)
	Four-Year	19 (57.58%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.03%)	9 (27.27%)	4 (12.12%)
Alumni or graduate surveys	Peer Group	9 (42.86%)	2 (9.52%)	2 (9.52%)	6 (28.57%)	2 (9.52%)
	Two-Year	24 (38.71%)	3 (4.84%)	4 (6.45%)	20 (32.26%)	11 (17.74%)
	Four-Year	7 (21.21%)	3 (9.09%)	5 (15.15%)	7 (21.21%)	11 (33.33%)



	Institutional Type	Never Used	Used in Past But Not Now	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Employer surveys or advisory groups	Peer Group	8 (38.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9 (42.86%)	4 (19.05%)
	Two-Year	19 (30.65%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.61%)	26 (41.94%)	16 (25.81%)
	Four-Year	12 (36.36%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	13 (39.39%)	4 (12.12%)
Student focus groups	Peer Group	10 (47.62%)	2 (9.52%)	2 (9.52%)	6 (28.57%)	1 (4.76%)
	Two-Year	27 (43.55%)	3 (4.84%)	10 (16.13%)	18 (29.03%)	4 (6.45%)
	Four-Year	20 (60.61%)	0 (0%)	7 (21.21%)	6 (18.18%)	0 (0%)
Student success measures (e.g. transfer rates, graduation rates, etc.)	Peer Group	3 (14.29%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (23.81%)	13 (61.9%)
	Two-Year	13 (20.97%)	0 (0%)	3 (4.84%)	9 (14.52%)	37 (59.68%)
	Four-Year	17 (51.52%)	0 (0%)	3 (9.09%)	6 (18.18%)	7 (21.21%)
Data on student performance after transfer or graduation	Peer Group	4 (19.05%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	12 (57.14%)	5 (23.81%)
	Two-Year	14 (22.58%)	0 (0%)	8 (12.9%)	27 (43.55%)	13 (20.97%)
	Four-Year	20 (60.61%)	0 (0%)	5 (15.15%)	5 (15.15%)	3 (9.09%)

9) What strategies are used to involve students in the general education assessment process at your institution? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Course-embedded assessments	21 (100%)	61 (98.39%)	28 (84.85%)
In-class administration of a standardized exam	12 (57.14%)	35 (56.45%)	17 (51.52%)
Participation in assessment is required outside of class	0 (0%)	8 (12.9%)	8 (24.24%)
Educational/outreach efforts (e.g. explaining the importance of assessment)	2 (9.52%)	14 (22.58%)	11 (33.33%)
Monetary incentives	4 (19.05%)	6 (9.68%)	16 (48.48%)
Non-monetary rewards (e.g. event tickets, prize drawings, etc.)	2 (9.52%)	5 (8.06%)	12 (36.36%)

9a) Which of these strategies (if any) do you find to be most effective?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Course-embedded and in-class assessments	16 (76.19%)	44 (70.97%)	24 (72.73%)
External rewards (monetary or non-monetary)	1 (4.76%)	1 (1.61%)	9 (27.27%)
Required participation	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.06%)
Educational/outreach efforts	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (9.09%)
Academic incentives (e.g. bonus points)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.06%)

10) Which of the following options would be most helpful in improving general education assessment practices at your institution? (Choose 3)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
More faculty involvement	10 (47.62%)	28 (45.16%)	18 (54.55%)
More student involvement	3 (14.29%)	8 (12.9%)	5 (15.15%)
Emphasis on assessment by institutional leaders	2 (9.52%)	9 (14.52%)	10 (30.3%)
Including student learning in the institutional strategic plan	2 (9.52%)	5 (8.06%)	3 (9.09%)
Additional faculty or staff expertise in assessment methods	13 (61.9%)	33 (53.23%)	18 (54.55%)
Better ways to measure student learning outcomes	5 (23.81%)	23 (37.1%)	10 (30.3%)
Additional resources (e.g. staff, funding)	12 (57.14%)	28 (45.16%)	13 (39.39%)
Information about practices and policies at peer institutions	4 (19.05%)	15 (24.19%)	9 (27.27%)
Agreement on general education/core curriculum learning outcomes throughout the state	8 (38.1%)	26 (41.94%)	9 (27.27%)

11) Please describe one or two practices used by your institution to assess general education competencies that you consider to be working well.

See attached list of responses

12) Please describe one or two significant challenges that your institution faces in assessing general education competencies.

See attached list of responses

**Use of General Education Assessment Findings**

13) With whom and how frequently are institutional-level reports on general education assessment findings shared?

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to	Occasionally	Frequently
Academic administrators	Peer Group	1 (4.76%)	2 (9.52%)	8 (38.1%)	10 (47.62%)
	Two-Year	3 (4.84%)	7 (11.29%)	16 (25.81%)	35 (56.45%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	9 (27.27%)	19 (57.58%)
Faculty	Peer Group	1 (4.76%)	3 (14.29%)	6 (28.57%)	11 (52.38%)
	Two-Year	2 (3.23%)	7 (11.29%)	24 (38.71%)	28 (45.16%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	15 (45.45%)	13 (39.39%)
Staff	Peer Group	6 (28.57%)	5 (23.81%)	7 (33.33%)	3 (14.29%)
	Two-Year	24 (38.71%)	10 (16.13%)	21 (33.87%)	6 (9.68%)
	Four-Year	14 (42.42%)	7 (21.21%)	9 (27.27%)	3 (9.09%)
Students	Peer Group	6 (28.57%)	6 (28.57%)	9 (42.86%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	26 (41.94%)	18 (29.03%)	17 (27.42%)	0 (0%)
	Four-Year	17 (51.52%)	9 (27.27%)	4 (12.12%)	3 (9.09%)
Governing boards	Peer Group	6 (28.57%)	4 (19.05%)	9 (42.86%)	2 (9.52%)
	Two-Year	14 (22.58%)	12 (19.35%)	26 (41.94%)	9 (14.52%)
	Four-Year	12 (36.36%)	4 (12.12%)	12 (36.36%)	5 (15.15%)
Accreditors (specialized or SACS)	Peer Group	1 (4.76%)	2 (9.52%)	15 (71.43%)	3 (14.29%)
	Two-Year	4 (6.45%)	7 (11.29%)	36 (58.06%)	14 (22.58%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	6 (18.18%)	12 (36.36%)	14 (42.42%)
Government regulatory bodies (state or federal)	Peer Group	3 (14.29%)	3 (14.29%)	10 (47.62%)	5 (23.81%)
	Two-Year	11 (17.74%)	8 (12.9%)	25 (40.32%)	17 (27.42%)
	Four-Year	5 (15.15%)	6 (18.18%)	11 (33.33%)	11 (33.33%)

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to	Occasionally	Frequently
Alumni	Peer Group	17 (80.95%)	2 (9.52%)	2 (9.52%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	44 (70.97%)	11 (17.74%)	6 (9.68%)	0 (0%)
	Four-Year	23 (69.7%)	7 (21.21%)	3 (9.09%)	0 (0%)
General public	Peer Group	14 (66.67%)	3 (14.29%)	4 (19.05%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	33 (53.23%)	13 (20.97%)	13 (20.97%)	2 (3.23%)
	Four-Year	21 (63.64%)	6 (18.18%)	5 (15.15%)	1 (3.03%)

14) Who makes decisions about changes to general education and/or the core curriculum based on assessment findings?  
(Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	14 (66.67%)	46 (74.19%)	20 (60.61%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	2 (9.52%)	4 (6.45%)	8 (24.24%)
Academic affairs committee	8 (38.1%)	24 (38.71%)	6 (18.18%)
General education/core curriculum committee	13 (61.9%)	43 (69.35%)	27 (81.82%)
Deans of individual colleges	3 (14.29%)	11 (17.74%)	16 (48.48%)
Department chairs or departmental undergraduate studies committees	14 (66.67%)	31 (50%)	17 (51.52%)
Faculty members	15 (71.43%)	39 (62.9%)	19 (57.58%)

15) To what extent has your institution used general education competencies assessment findings for each of the following?

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Prepare for institutional accreditation	Peer Group	1 (4.76%)	1 (4.76%)	7 (33.33%)	12 (57.14%)
	Two-Year	2 (3.23%)	6 (9.68%)	16 (25.81%)	38 (61.29%)
	Four-Year	2 (6.06%)	4 (12.12%)	4 (12.12%)	23 (69.7%)
Prepare for specialized accreditation	Peer Group	9 (42.86%)	0 (0%)	6 (28.57%)	6 (28.57%)
	Two-Year	16 (25.81%)	3 (4.84%)	21 (33.87%)	22 (35.48%)
	Four-Year	7 (21.21%)	5 (15.15%)	10 (30.3%)	11 (33.33%)

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Provide data for public accountability (e.g. VSA)	Peer Group	13 (61.9%)	0 (0%)	8 (38.1%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	33 (53.23%)	9 (14.52%)	17 (27.42%)	3 (4.84%)
	Four-Year	5 (15.15%)	3 (9.09%)	5 (15.15%)	20 (60.61%)
Respond to assessment requirements set by THECB and/or governing board	Peer Group	1 (4.76%)	1 (4.76%)	10 (47.62%)	9 (42.86%)
	Two-Year	2 (3.23%)	6 (9.68%)	22 (35.48%)	32 (51.61%)
	Four-Year	2 (6.06%)	6 (18.18%)	7 (21.21%)	18 (54.55%)
Revise general education competencies	Peer Group	3 (14.29%)	4 (19.05%)	10 (47.62%)	4 (19.05%)
	Two-Year	5 (8.06%)	12 (19.35%)	29 (46.77%)	16 (25.81%)
	Four-Year	4 (12.12%)	13 (39.39%)	9 (27.27%)	7 (21.21%)
Make changes to general education/core curriculum	Peer Group	1 (4.76%)	5 (23.81%)	10 (47.62%)	5 (23.81%)
	Two-Year	4 (6.45%)	15 (24.19%)	24 (38.71%)	19 (30.65%)
	Four-Year	3 (9.09%)	13 (39.39%)	8 (24.24%)	9 (27.27%)
Refine assessment process and/or measures	Peer Group	1 (4.76%)	5 (23.81%)	7 (33.33%)	8 (38.1%)
	Two-Year	5 (8.06%)	16 (25.81%)	16 (25.81%)	25 (40.32%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	11 (33.33%)	17 (51.52%)
Determine student readiness for upper-level coursework	Peer Group	8 (38.1%)	4 (19.05%)	5 (23.81%)	4 (19.05%)
	Two-Year	21 (33.87%)	16 (25.81%)	12 (19.35%)	13 (20.97%)
	Four-Year	18 (54.55%)	9 (27.27%)	4 (12.12%)	2 (6.06%)
Align curricula and/or learning outcomes with K-12 and/or feeder colleges/universities	Peer Group	6 (28.57%)	6 (28.57%)	7 (33.33%)	2 (9.52%)
	Two-Year	13 (20.97%)	27 (43.55%)	17 (27.42%)	5 (8.06%)
	Four-Year	16 (48.48%)	8 (24.24%)	5 (15.15%)	4 (12.12%)

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Align curricula and/or learning outcomes between general education and major sequence courses	Peer Group	9 (42.86%)	2 (9.52%)	6 (28.57%)	4 (19.05%)
	Two-Year	20 (32.26%)	19 (30.65%)	14 (22.58%)	9 (14.52%)
	Four-Year	12 (36.36%)	11 (33.33%)	6 (18.18%)	4 (12.12%)
Improve teaching (e.g. faculty development programs)	Peer Group	0 (0%)	4 (19.05%)	11 (52.38%)	6 (28.57%)
	Two-Year	3 (4.84%)	15 (24.19%)	19 (30.65%)	25 (40.32%)
	Four-Year	10 (30.3%)	7 (21.21%)	11 (33.33%)	5 (15.15%)
Make decisions about faculty tenure, promotion, or merit raises	Peer Group	19 (90.48%)	0 (0%)	2 (9.52%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	53 (85.48%)	4 (6.45%)	4 (6.45%)	1 (1.61%)
	Four-Year	29 (87.88%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	0 (0%)
Allocate resources to departments	Peer Group	16 (76.19%)	1 (4.76%)	3 (14.29%)	1 (4.76%)
	Two-Year	41 (66.13%)	10 (16.13%)	9 (14.52%)	2 (3.23%)
	Four-Year	26 (78.79%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	3 (9.09%)
Recruit prospective students	Peer Group	19 (90.48%)	1 (4.76%)	1 (4.76%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	53 (85.48%)	4 (6.45%)	5 (8.06%)	0 (0%)
	Four-Year	27 (81.82%)	4 (12.12%)	2 (6.06%)	0 (0%)
Make decisions related to strategic planning	Peer Group	4 (19.05%)	4 (19.05%)	8 (38.1%)	5 (23.81%)
	Two-Year	6 (9.68%)	14 (22.58%)	25 (40.32%)	17 (27.42%)
	Four-Year	11 (33.33%)	9 (27.27%)	8 (24.24%)	5 (15.15%)

16) Has your institution made any recent changes to general education and/or the core curriculum as a result of the assessment process?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	8 (38.1%)	24 (38.71%)	11 (33.33%)
No	8 (38.1%)	21 (33.87%)	13 (39.39%)
In Process	4 (19.05%)	15 (24.19%)	9 (27.27%)

16a) (If yes or in process) Please briefly describe the changes to general education and/or the core curriculum and the reasons for making them.

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (39)	Four-Year Institutions (20)
Defined new general education competencies	0 (0%)	1 (2.56%)	5 (25%)
Mapped general education competencies to curriculum	1 (8.33%)	3 (7.69%)	2 (10%)
Reduced number of hours in core curriculum	0 (0%)	2 (5.13%)	2 (10%)
Added/dropped general education requirements	4 (33.33%)	6 (15.38%)	2 (10%)
Dropped excess general education courses/streamlined core	1 (8.33%)	4 (10.26%)	1 (5%)
Added/dropped courses based on coverage of general education competencies	1 (8.33%)	5 (12.82%)	5 (25%)
Changed general education course content	2 (16.67%)	6 (15.38%)	7 (35%)
Changed general education assessment plan	3 (25%)	7 (17.95%)	5 (25%)



# General Education Assessment Practices Survey 2009

## Small Community Colleges Accountability Peer Group Responses

Number of responses from peer group: 9

### Structure of and Resources for General Education Assessment

1) Which offices and/or groups are responsible for the following aspects of assessing general education competencies at your institution? (Choose all that apply)

Peer Group	Selecting Assessment Methods	Developing Assessment Instruments	Collecting & Analyzing Data	Reviewing Assessment Findings	Other Assessment Work
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	6 (66.67%)	3 (33.33%)	3 (33.33%)	8 (88.89%)	5 (55.56%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	1 (11.11%)	1 (11.11%)	2 (22.22%)	2 (22.22%)	1 (11.11%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	1 (11.11%)	2 (22.22%)	3 (33.33%)	2 (22.22%)	2 (22.22%)
Office of Institutional Research	2 (22.22%)	3 (33.33%)	6 (66.67%)	4 (44.44%)	3 (33.33%)
General education assessment committee	4 (44.44%)	3 (33.33%)	3 (33.33%)	5 (55.56%)	2 (22.22%)
Faculty members	6 (66.67%)	6 (66.67%)	6 (66.67%)	6 (66.67%)	3 (33.33%)
Deans/Division Chairs/Dept. Chairs	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

All Two-Year Institutions (62)	Selecting Assessment Methods	Developing Assessment Instruments	Collecting & Analyzing Data	Reviewing Assessment Findings	Other Assessment Work
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	32 (51.61%)	19 (30.65%)	19 (30.65%)	49 (79.03%)	18 (29.03%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	3 (4.84%)	2 (3.23%)	2 (3.23%)	6 (9.68%)	1 (1.61%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	18 (29.03%)	21 (33.87%)	29 (46.77%)	29 (46.77%)	17 (27.42%)
Office of Institutional Research	17 (27.42%)	23 (37.1%)	37 (59.68%)	29 (46.77%)	23 (37.1%)
General education assessment committee	25 (40.32%)	23 (37.1%)	27 (43.55%)	30 (48.39%)	12 (19.35%)
Faculty members	47 (75.81%)	52 (83.87%)	39 (62.9%)	44 (70.97%)	16 (25.81%)
Deans/Division Chairs/Dept. Chairs	8 (12.9%)	6 (9.68%)	8 (12.9%)	6 (9.68%)	3 (4.84%)

All Four-Year Institutions (33)	Selecting Assessment Methods	Developing Assessment Instruments	Collecting & Analyzing Data	Reviewing Assessment Findings	Other Assessment Work
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	13 (39.39%)	9 (27.27%)	7 (21.21%)	23 (69.7%)	12 (36.36%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	8 (24.24%)	6 (18.18%)	5 (15.15%)	10 (30.3%)	7 (21.21%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	14 (42.42%)	14 (42.42%)	20 (60.61%)	22 (66.67%)	14 (42.42%)
Office of Institutional Research	7 (21.21%)	12 (36.36%)	19 (57.58%)	11 (33.33%)	13 (39.39%)
General education assessment committee	17 (51.52%)	15 (45.45%)	14 (42.42%)	21 (63.64%)	10 (30.3%)
Faculty members	23 (69.7%)	27 (81.82%)	24 (72.73%)	24 (72.73%)	12 (36.36%)
Deans/Division Chairs/Dept. Chairs	1 (3.03%)	1 (3.03%)	2 (6.06%)	4 (12.12%)	2 (6.06%)

2) Please briefly describe the process through which your institution assesses general education competencies.

See attached list of responses

3) Does your institution have one or more staff positions whose primary focus is learning assessment?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	2 (22.22%)	21 (33.87%)	26 (78.79%)
No	7 (77.78%)	41 (66.13%)	7 (21.21%)

3a) (If yes) In what office or offices is this position or positions located? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (21)	Four-Year Institutions (26)
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	1 (50%)	9 (42.86%)	12 (46.15%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (11.54%)
Office of Assessment/Accountability/Institutional Effectiveness	0 (0%)	10 (47.62%)	17 (65.38%)
Office of Institutional Research	1 (50%)	7 (33.33%)	10 (38.46%)
Academic colleges or departments	0 (0%)	1 (4.76%)	5 (19.23%)

4) What resources are available at your institution to support assessment of general education competencies? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Assessment training for faculty or staff as part of formal professional development activities (e.g. in-service sessions, orientation for new faculty)	7 (77.78%)	44 (70.97%)	19 (57.58%)
Optional assessment workshops for faculty or staff	4 (44.44%)	40 (64.52%)	26 (78.79%)
One-on-one consultation with faculty	6 (66.67%)	44 (70.97%)	30 (90.91%)
Funding for faculty or staff to attend assessment conferences or training	6 (66.67%)	53 (85.48%)	27 (81.82%)
Funding or release time for faculty or staff to work on assessment	0 (0%)	22 (35.48%)	9 (27.27%)
Books/reference materials on assessment distributed to faculty or staff	5 (55.56%)	44 (70.97%)	23 (69.7%)

5) Does your institution use centralized software for assessment data collection and reporting?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	2 (22.22%)	23 (37.1%)	22 (66.67%)
No	4 (44.44%)	23 (37.1%)	7 (21.21%)
In Process	3 (33.33%)	16 (25.81%)	4 (12.12%)

5a) (If yes or in process) Which software package do you use or plan to use? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (39)	Four-Year Institutions (26)
Blackboard	0 (0%)	6 (15.38%)	7 (26.92%)
Datatel	0 (0%)	3 (7.69%)	1 (3.85%)
Strategic Planning Online (SPOL)	4 (80%)	8 (20.51%)	1 (3.85%)
Task Stream	0 (0%)	2 (5.13%)	4 (15.38%)
Tk20	0 (0%)	1 (2.56%)	1 (3.85%)
TracDat	0 (0%)	5 (12.82%)	5 (19.23%)
Weave Online	0 (0%)	8 (20.51%)	8 (30.77%)
Locally-developed software	3 (60%)	9 (23.08%)	5 (19.23%)
OATS	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (7.69%)
Banner	0 (0%)	1 (2.08%)	1 (3.85%)
Other	1 (20%)	7 (14.58%)	3 (11.54%)

5b) (If yes or in process) How long have you been using this software package?

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (39)	Four-Year Institutions (26)
In process of adopting	1 (20%)	8 (20.51%)	3 (11.54%)
Less than 1 year	1 (20%)	8 (20.51%)	9 (34.62%)
Between 1 and 3 years	0 (0%)	5 (12.82%)	3 (11.54%)
3 years	0 (0%)	5 (12.82%)	6 (23.08%)
4 or more years	0 (0%)	3 (7.69%)	4 (15.38%)
Use multiple programs	2 (40%)	5 (12.82%)	1 (3.85%)

**General Education Assessment Practices**

6) What is the cycle on which your institution assesses all general education competencies and reviews the assessment findings (recognizing that specific competencies may be assessed on a more frequent schedule)?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Every semester	3 (33.33%)	9 (14.52%)	3 (9.09%)
Every year	4 (44.44%)	25 (40.32%)	12 (36.36%)
Every two years	0 (0%)	6 (9.68%)	4 (12.12%)
Every 2-3 years	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.06%)
Every three years or beyond	2 (22.22%)	18 (29.03%)	7 (21.21%)
In process of determining	0 (0%)	2 (3.23%)	3 (9.09%)

7) Does your institution use general knowledge and skills exams to assess general education competencies (e.g. CAAP, CLA, MAPP)?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	2 (22.22%)	17 (27.42%)	29 (87.88%)
No	6 (66.67%)	41 (66.13%)	1 (3.03%)
In Process	1 (11.11%)	4 (6.45%)	3 (9.09%)

7a) (If yes) Which standardized exam(s) is/are used to measure general education competencies at your institution? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (21)	Four-Year Institutions (32)
CAAP	1 (33.33%)	9 (42.86%)	7 (21.88%)
CBASE	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.13%)
CCTST	0 (0%)	1 (4.76%)	1 (3.13%)
CLA	0 (0%)	2 (9.52%)	15 (46.88%)
MAPP	1 (33.33%)	7 (33.33%)	11 (34.38%)
WorkKeys	0 (0%)	2 (9.52%)	0 (0%)
Institutionally-developed exam	1 (33.33%)	2 (9.52%)	3 (9.38%)
NSF Critical Thinking Assessment	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.13%)

7b) (If yes) Which students at your institution take the general knowledge and skills exam(s)? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (21)	Four-Year Institutions (32)
All students completing general education and/or core curriculum (e.g. rising junior exam)	0 (0%)	3 (14.29%)	1 (3.13%)
All graduating students	0 (0%)	1 (4.76%)	1 (3.13%)
A sample of students completing general education and/or core curriculum	2 (66.67%)	11 (52.38%)	5 (15.63%)
A sample of graduating students	1 (33.33%)	4 (19.05%)	4 (12.5%)
A sample of first-year and senior students	1 (33.33%)	2 (9.52%)	23 (71.88%)

8) Which methods of assessing general education competencies are used at your institution and to what extent?

	Institutional Type	Never Used	Used in Past But Not Now	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Course grades in general education and/or core curriculum classes	Peer Group	1 (11.11%)	4 (44.44%)	0 (0%)	3 (33.33%)	1 (11.11%)
	Two-Year	16 (25.81%)	12 (19.35%)	2 (3.23%)	11 (17.74%)	21 (33.87%)
	Four-Year	24 (72.73%)	4 (12.12%)	1 (3.03%)	1 (3.03%)	3 (9.09%)
Course grades in more advanced classes that build on general education and/or core curriculum classes	Peer Group	4 (44.44%)	2 (22.22%)	0 (0%)	1 (11.11%)	2 (22.22%)
	Two-Year	33 (53.23%)	2 (3.23%)	5 (8.06%)	13 (20.97%)	9 (14.52%)
	Four-Year	27 (81.82%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	1 (3.03%)	1 (3.03%)

	Institutional Type	Never Used	Used in Past But Not Now	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Student work from individual course sections (e.g. quizzes, exams, essays, research papers)	Peer Group	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (22.22%)	7 (77.78%)
	Two-Year	1 (1.61%)	1 (1.61%)	5 (8.06%)	13 (20.97%)	42 (67.74%)
	Four-Year	4 (12.12%)	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	4 (12.12%)	20 (60.61%)
Common exams, exam questions, assignments, and/or grading rubrics to assess student work across course sections	Peer Group	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (44.44%)	5 (55.56%)
	Two-Year	3 (4.84%)	0 (0%)	6 (9.68%)	18 (29.03%)	35 (56.45%)
	Four-Year	2 (6.06%)	0 (0%)	4 (12.12%)	7 (21.21%)	20 (60.61%)
Observations of student performance (e.g. simulations, labs, recitals)	Peer Group	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (88.89%)	1 (11.11%)
	Two-Year	6 (9.68%)	0 (0%)	6 (9.68%)	29 (46.77%)	21 (33.87%)
	Four-Year	4 (12.12%)	0 (0%)	7 (21.21%)	13 (39.39%)	9 (27.27%)
Cumulative assessments (e.g. capstone projects, portfolios)	Peer Group	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (44.44%)	5 (55.56%)
	Two-Year	14 (22.58%)	0 (0%)	10 (16.13%)	21 (33.87%)	17 (27.42%)
	Four-Year	6 (18.18%)	0 (0%)	9 (27.27%)	13 (39.39%)	5 (15.15%)
Student surveys (e.g. NSSE/CCSSE, CIRP surveys, locally-developed surveys)	Peer Group	2 (22.22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (33.33%)	4 (44.44%)
	Two-Year	7 (11.29%)	2 (3.23%)	4 (6.45%)	18 (29.03%)	31 (50%)
	Four-Year	5 (15.15%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.03%)	6 (18.18%)	21 (63.64%)
Faculty surveys	Peer Group	4 (44.44%)	1 (11.11%)	0 (0%)	3 (33.33%)	1 (11.11%)
	Two-Year	29 (46.77%)	1 (1.61%)	9 (14.52%)	17 (27.42%)	6 (9.68%)
	Four-Year	19 (57.58%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.03%)	9 (27.27%)	4 (12.12%)
Alumni or graduate surveys	Peer Group	2 (22.22%)	1 (11.11%)	1 (11.11%)	3 (33.33%)	2 (22.22%)
	Two-Year	24 (38.71%)	3 (4.84%)	4 (6.45%)	20 (32.26%)	11 (17.74%)
	Four-Year	7 (21.21%)	3 (9.09%)	5 (15.15%)	7 (21.21%)	11 (33.33%)



	Institutional Type	Never Used	Used in Past But Not Now	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Employer surveys or advisory groups	Peer Group	1 (11.11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (66.67%)	2 (22.22%)
	Two-Year	19 (30.65%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.61%)	26 (41.94%)	16 (25.81%)
	Four-Year	12 (36.36%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	13 (39.39%)	4 (12.12%)
Student focus groups	Peer Group	4 (44.44%)	1 (11.11%)	1 (11.11%)	2 (22.22%)	1 (11.11%)
	Two-Year	27 (43.55%)	3 (4.84%)	10 (16.13%)	18 (29.03%)	4 (6.45%)
	Four-Year	20 (60.61%)	0 (0%)	7 (21.21%)	6 (18.18%)	0 (0%)
Student success measures (e.g. transfer rates, graduation rates, etc.)	Peer Group	3 (33.33%)	0 (0%)	1 (11.11%)	1 (11.11%)	4 (44.44%)
	Two-Year	13 (20.97%)	0 (0%)	3 (4.84%)	9 (14.52%)	37 (59.68%)
	Four-Year	17 (51.52%)	0 (0%)	3 (9.09%)	6 (18.18%)	7 (21.21%)
Data on student performance after transfer or graduation	Peer Group	2 (22.22%)	0 (0%)	1 (11.11%)	3 (33.33%)	3 (33.33%)
	Two-Year	14 (22.58%)	0 (0%)	8 (12.9%)	27 (43.55%)	13 (20.97%)
	Four-Year	20 (60.61%)	0 (0%)	5 (15.15%)	5 (15.15%)	3 (9.09%)

9) What strategies are used to involve students in the general education assessment process at your institution? (Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Course-embedded assessments	8 (88.89%)	61 (98.39%)	28 (84.85%)
In-class administration of a standardized exam	6 (66.67%)	35 (56.45%)	17 (51.52%)
Participation in assessment is required outside of class	3 (33.33%)	8 (12.9%)	8 (24.24%)
Educational/outreach efforts (e.g. explaining the importance of assessment)	4 (44.44%)	14 (22.58%)	11 (33.33%)
Monetary incentives	0 (0%)	6 (9.68%)	16 (48.48%)
Non-monetary rewards (e.g. event tickets, prize drawings, etc.)	2 (22.22%)	5 (8.06%)	12 (36.36%)

9a) Which of these strategies (if any) do you find to be most effective?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Course-embedded and in-class assessments	8 (88.89%)	44 (70.97%)	24 (72.73%)
External rewards (monetary or non-monetary)	0 (0%)	1 (1.61%)	9 (27.27%)
Required participation	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.06%)
Educational/outreach efforts	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (9.09%)
Academic incentives (e.g. bonus points)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (6.06%)

10) Which of the following options would be most helpful in improving general education assessment practices at your institution? (Choose 3)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
More faculty involvement	2 (22.22%)	28 (45.16%)	18 (54.55%)
More student involvement	1 (11.11%)	8 (12.9%)	5 (15.15%)
Emphasis on assessment by institutional leaders	0 (0%)	9 (14.52%)	10 (30.3%)
Including student learning in the institutional strategic plan	1 (11.11%)	5 (8.06%)	3 (9.09%)
Additional faculty or staff expertise in assessment methods	4 (44.44%)	33 (53.23%)	18 (54.55%)
Better ways to measure student learning outcomes	6 (66.67%)	23 (37.1%)	10 (30.3%)
Additional resources (e.g. staff, funding)	4 (44.44%)	28 (45.16%)	13 (39.39%)
Information about practices and policies at peer institutions	3 (33.33%)	15 (24.19%)	9 (27.27%)
Agreement on general education/core curriculum learning outcomes throughout the state	6 (66.67%)	26 (41.94%)	9 (27.27%)

11) Please describe one or two practices used by your institution to assess general education competencies that you consider to be working well.

See attached list of responses

12) Please describe one or two significant challenges that your institution faces in assessing general education competencies.

See attached list of responses

**Use of General Education Assessment Findings**

13) With whom and how frequently are institutional-level reports on general education assessment findings shared?

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to	Occasionally	Frequently
Academic administrators	Peer Group	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (11.11%)	8 (88.89%)
	Two-Year	3 (4.84%)	7 (11.29%)	16 (25.81%)	35 (56.45%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	9 (27.27%)	19 (57.58%)
Faculty	Peer Group	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (44.44%)	5 (55.56%)
	Two-Year	2 (3.23%)	7 (11.29%)	24 (38.71%)	28 (45.16%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	15 (45.45%)	13 (39.39%)
Staff	Peer Group	3 (33.33%)	0 (0%)	6 (66.67%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	24 (38.71%)	10 (16.13%)	21 (33.87%)	6 (9.68%)
	Four-Year	14 (42.42%)	7 (21.21%)	9 (27.27%)	3 (9.09%)
Students	Peer Group	4 (44.44%)	4 (44.44%)	1 (11.11%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	26 (41.94%)	18 (29.03%)	17 (27.42%)	0 (0%)
	Four-Year	17 (51.52%)	9 (27.27%)	4 (12.12%)	3 (9.09%)
Governing boards	Peer Group	2 (22.22%)	0 (0%)	5 (55.56%)	2 (22.22%)
	Two-Year	14 (22.58%)	12 (19.35%)	26 (41.94%)	9 (14.52%)
	Four-Year	12 (36.36%)	4 (12.12%)	12 (36.36%)	5 (15.15%)
Accreditors (specialized or SACS)	Peer Group	0 (0%)	1 (11.11%)	6 (66.67%)	2 (22.22%)
	Two-Year	4 (6.45%)	7 (11.29%)	36 (58.06%)	14 (22.58%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	6 (18.18%)	12 (36.36%)	14 (42.42%)
Government regulatory bodies (state or federal)	Peer Group	1 (11.11%)	1 (11.11%)	6 (66.67%)	1 (11.11%)
	Two-Year	11 (17.74%)	8 (12.9%)	25 (40.32%)	17 (27.42%)
	Four-Year	5 (15.15%)	6 (18.18%)	11 (33.33%)	11 (33.33%)

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to	Occasionally	Frequently
Alumni	Peer Group	6 (66.67%)	3 (33.33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	44 (70.97%)	11 (17.74%)	6 (9.68%)	0 (0%)
	Four-Year	23 (69.7%)	7 (21.21%)	3 (9.09%)	0 (0%)
General public	Peer Group	2 (22.22%)	4 (44.44%)	3 (33.33%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	33 (53.23%)	13 (20.97%)	13 (20.97%)	2 (3.23%)
	Four-Year	21 (63.64%)	6 (18.18%)	5 (15.15%)	1 (3.03%)

14) Who makes decisions about changes to general education and/or the core curriculum based on assessment findings?  
(Choose all that apply)

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer	9 (100%)	46 (74.19%)	20 (60.61%)
College/Office of Undergraduate or General Studies	2 (22.22%)	4 (6.45%)	8 (24.24%)
Academic affairs committee	5 (55.56%)	24 (38.71%)	6 (18.18%)
General education/core curriculum committee	7 (77.78%)	43 (69.35%)	27 (81.82%)
Deans of individual colleges	1 (11.11%)	11 (17.74%)	16 (48.48%)
Department chairs or departmental undergraduate studies committees	4 (44.44%)	31 (50%)	17 (51.52%)
Faculty members	4 (44.44%)	39 (62.9%)	19 (57.58%)

15) To what extent has your institution used general education competencies assessment findings for each of the following?

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Prepare for institutional accreditation	Peer Group	0 (0%)	1 (11.11%)	2 (22.22%)	6 (66.67%)
	Two-Year	2 (3.23%)	6 (9.68%)	16 (25.81%)	38 (61.29%)
	Four-Year	2 (6.06%)	4 (12.12%)	4 (12.12%)	23 (69.7%)
Prepare for specialized accreditation	Peer Group	2 (22.22%)	0 (0%)	3 (33.33%)	4 (44.44%)
	Two-Year	16 (25.81%)	3 (4.84%)	21 (33.87%)	22 (35.48%)
	Four-Year	7 (21.21%)	5 (15.15%)	10 (30.3%)	11 (33.33%)

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Provide data for public accountability (e.g. VSA)	Peer Group	5 (55.56%)	1 (11.11%)	2 (22.22%)	1 (11.11%)
	Two-Year	33 (53.23%)	9 (14.52%)	17 (27.42%)	3 (4.84%)
	Four-Year	5 (15.15%)	3 (9.09%)	5 (15.15%)	20 (60.61%)
Respond to assessment requirements set by THECB and/or governing board	Peer Group	0 (0%)	2 (22.22%)	4 (44.44%)	3 (33.33%)
	Two-Year	2 (3.23%)	6 (9.68%)	22 (35.48%)	32 (51.61%)
	Four-Year	2 (6.06%)	6 (18.18%)	7 (21.21%)	18 (54.55%)
Revise general education competencies	Peer Group	1 (11.11%)	2 (22.22%)	3 (33.33%)	3 (33.33%)
	Two-Year	5 (8.06%)	12 (19.35%)	29 (46.77%)	16 (25.81%)
	Four-Year	4 (12.12%)	13 (39.39%)	9 (27.27%)	7 (21.21%)
Make changes to general education/core curriculum	Peer Group	1 (11.11%)	2 (22.22%)	3 (33.33%)	3 (33.33%)
	Two-Year	4 (6.45%)	15 (24.19%)	24 (38.71%)	19 (30.65%)
	Four-Year	3 (9.09%)	13 (39.39%)	8 (24.24%)	9 (27.27%)
Refine assessment process and/or measures	Peer Group	1 (11.11%)	2 (22.22%)	1 (11.11%)	5 (55.56%)
	Two-Year	5 (8.06%)	16 (25.81%)	16 (25.81%)	25 (40.32%)
	Four-Year	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	11 (33.33%)	17 (51.52%)
Determine student readiness for upper-level coursework	Peer Group	2 (22.22%)	2 (22.22%)	3 (33.33%)	2 (22.22%)
	Two-Year	21 (33.87%)	16 (25.81%)	12 (19.35%)	13 (20.97%)
	Four-Year	18 (54.55%)	9 (27.27%)	4 (12.12%)	2 (6.06%)
Align curricula and/or learning outcomes with K-12 and/or feeder colleges/universities	Peer Group	2 (22.22%)	4 (44.44%)	3 (33.33%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	13 (20.97%)	27 (43.55%)	17 (27.42%)	5 (8.06%)
	Four-Year	16 (48.48%)	8 (24.24%)	5 (15.15%)	4 (12.12%)

	Institutional Type	Never	Planning to Use	Use Occasionally	Use Frequently
Align curricula and/or learning outcomes between general education and major sequence courses	Peer Group	5 (55.56%)	1 (11.11%)	2 (22.22%)	1 (11.11%)
	Two-Year	20 (32.26%)	19 (30.65%)	14 (22.58%)	9 (14.52%)
	Four-Year	12 (36.36%)	11 (33.33%)	6 (18.18%)	4 (12.12%)
Improve teaching (e.g. faculty development programs)	Peer Group	1 (11.11%)	2 (22.22%)	2 (22.22%)	4 (44.44%)
	Two-Year	3 (4.84%)	15 (24.19%)	19 (30.65%)	25 (40.32%)
	Four-Year	10 (30.3%)	7 (21.21%)	11 (33.33%)	5 (15.15%)
Make decisions about faculty tenure, promotion, or merit raises	Peer Group	8 (88.89%)	1 (11.11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	53 (85.48%)	4 (6.45%)	4 (6.45%)	1 (1.61%)
	Four-Year	29 (87.88%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	0 (0%)
Allocate resources to departments	Peer Group	7 (77.78%)	2 (22.22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	41 (66.13%)	10 (16.13%)	9 (14.52%)	2 (3.23%)
	Four-Year	26 (78.79%)	2 (6.06%)	2 (6.06%)	3 (9.09%)
Recruit prospective students	Peer Group	7 (77.78%)	1 (11.11%)	1 (11.11%)	0 (0%)
	Two-Year	53 (85.48%)	4 (6.45%)	5 (8.06%)	0 (0%)
	Four-Year	27 (81.82%)	4 (12.12%)	2 (6.06%)	0 (0%)
Make decisions related to strategic planning	Peer Group	1 (11.11%)	2 (22.22%)	3 (33.33%)	3 (33.33%)
	Two-Year	6 (9.68%)	14 (22.58%)	25 (40.32%)	17 (27.42%)
	Four-Year	11 (33.33%)	9 (27.27%)	8 (24.24%)	5 (15.15%)

16) Has your institution made any recent changes to general education and/or the core curriculum as a result of the assessment process?

	Peer Group	All Two-Year Institutions (62)	All Four-Year Institutions (33)
Yes	5 (55.56%)	24 (38.71%)	11 (33.33%)
No	3 (33.33%)	21 (33.87%)	13 (39.39%)
In Process	1 (11.11%)	15 (24.19%)	9 (27.27%)

16a) (If yes or in process) Please briefly describe the changes to general education and/or the core curriculum and the reasons for making them.

	Peer Group	Two-Year Institutions (39)	Four-Year Institutions (20)
Defined new general education competencies	0 (0%)	1 (2.56%)	5 (25%)
Mapped general education competencies to curriculum	0 (0%)	3 (7.69%)	2 (10%)
Reduced number of hours in core curriculum	0 (0%)	2 (5.13%)	2 (10%)
Added/dropped general education requirements	1 (16.67%)	6 (15.38%)	2 (10%)
Dropped excess general education courses/streamlined core	1 (16.67%)	4 (10.26%)	1 (5%)
Added/dropped courses based on coverage of general education competencies	1 (16.67%)	5 (12.82%)	5 (25%)
Changed general education course content	3 (50%)	6 (15.38%)	7 (35%)
Changed general education assessment plan	0 (0%)	7 (17.95%)	5 (25%)



HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY INSTITUTE  
A Project of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board

General Education Assessment  
Practices Survey 2009

Responses to Open-Ended Questions  
Two-Year Institutions

## Two-Year Institutions

Please briefly describe the process through which your institution assesses general education competencies.

<p>1.The General education assessment committee and faculty decide on an SLO focus. 2.They determine the method of assessment 3.They administer the assessment 4.They collect and analyze the data 5.They recommend and implement changes and then re-assess.</p>
<p>The College has always maintained a College-wide core curriculum assessment committee. The Core Assessment Committee's role is to lead the College in addressing the existing core status and data. This assessment results in future improvements.</p>
<p>We have a Program Review Committee comprised of faculty, administration and IR staff. This committee oversees the process of evaluating the core competencies. Disciplines are set up on a 5 year cycle--during the 5th year a comprehensive evaluation with the committee takes place. During the other years, an annual assessment is done and reported electronically and within the academic area with the president and chief academic officer.</p>
<p>[We] utilize a core-curriculum assessment subcommittee that reports directly to the Curriculum Committee. Each Spring semester the various core curriculum divisions gather data according to the core curriculum evaluation plan submitted to the THECB in 2004. The data is collected each Spring and the results are sent to the Core Curriculum Assessment Committee each Fall for analysis, review and dissemination of results and appropriate administrators.</p>
<p>1) Student Learning Outcomes Committee (SLO) established plan and timeline for measures of general education competencies. 2) Committee members work with division chairs on carrying out plan. 3) Faculty are assigned course sections for evaluation, identify method, develop instrument and report findings. 4) Findings are collected by Student Learning Outcomes Committee (SLO) and sent to the Office of Institutional Research for analysis. 5) Findings are discussed by faculty to make improvements.</p>
<p>[We] assess general education coursework [that] is equivalent to the core curriculum coursework mandated by the THECB. The process is as follows. [We] assess the general education based up four categories. These are 1) Communication and Collaboration 2) Problem Solving, Critical Thinking, and Technical Literacy 3) Creative Process and 4) Personal Growth and Development. An assessment committee comprised of faculty identifies learning outcomes and develops the rubrics used for assessment. Courses that satisfy the core curriculum requirements are used to collect samples for assessment. Samples of student work are collected in the spring and assessed during the following summer. Results are compiled, analyzed, and presented to the assessment committee by the divisional dean. The committee then discusses the findings and recommendations are made on actions that would improve student's success in meeting the learning outcomes. Re-assessment of the learning outcomes for each category follows after sufficient time has passed to incorporate recommended actions.</p>
<p>General Education competencies are constantly reviewed through annual assessment reports, academic program reviews, the Academic Standards Committee and the General Education Committee (GEC). In 2007 five competency areas were identified: (1) Reading and Writing, (2) Speaking and Listening, (3) Critical Thinking and Problem Solving, (4) Ethics and Community, and (5) Technology and Computer Literacy. Formal institution-wide assessment for General Education competencies began in the spring of 2009. At the present time, one new competency area is being evaluated each semester by assessing two outcomes from that competency. An additional new competency area will be added during each subsequent semester until all competencies are being assessed on a regular basis. After the first assessment cycle, it is expected that these outcomes will be assessed on an annual basis. A report on each assessment will be written by the GEC with the collaboration of the Assessment Committee with recommendations for changes based on the results. The report will be submitted to the Chief Academic Officer for disbursement to the proper areas.</p>
<p>Artifacts are generated from a random sample of classes and students who have taken more than 30 hours in those classes. A committee of faculty then conduct a blind review of the artifacts, identifying whether the artifact meets the objectives of the competency.</p>
<p>Faculty collect course-based data, analyze whether the individual sections have met the goal, and make general suggestions about improving student mastery. In addition to this rigorous course-based assessment of the general education competencies, [we have] continued to develop additional means for assessing the six Intellectual Competencies of Reading, Writing, Listening, Speaking, Critical Thinking, and Computer Literacy, the</p>

over-arching general education competencies expected for graduates. The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board identified and published the six Intellectual Competencies for the Core Curriculum. Beginning in the Fall 2009, [we] began piloting a set of rubrics created by [the] General Education Assessment Subcommittee to evaluate the Intellectual Competencies of Reading, Writing, Speaking, Listening, Critical Thinking, and Computer Literacy. The General Education Subcommittee has been developing plans for the assessment of the Intellectual Competencies which will require the instructors of each of the randomly selected courses to prepare an assessment activity (test, quiz, assignment, etc.) based on the standard rubric. During the Fall 2009 semester, faculty teaching Capstone courses were asked to develop an activity for Computer Literacy, Reading, or Speaking and to assess it using the respective rubric developed by the General Education Subcommittee. The College also uses the CAAP Exam along with rubric assessment: CAAP Exams for Writing Skills and Reading and rubrics for Listening, Writing, and Critical Thinking will be used to assess activities. This portion of the assessment process along with rubric calibration will be repeated on a yearly basis across the institution. In addition, the College assesses the graduates' perceptions of the attainment of core competencies by using graduate and employer follow-up survey data and also CCSSE survey data.

The assessment of general education competencies takes student artifacts during the fall semester and evaluates them for communication, critical thinking, cultural/aesthetic responsiveness, information literacy, qualitative reasoning, scientific inquiry, technology application, and developmental preparation. Student artifacts are selected using an administrative software query to identify students who 1) have more than 30 semester credit hours, and 2) have completed or currently enrolled in Composition I and any social or behavioral science course. The artifacts are then assessed using a scoring rubric and the results are forwarded to review by the vice president for student learning, and the interim vice president for institutional effectiveness and system research.

[We] use an annual process of assessment. Institution level rubrics are used. Student artifacts are drawn from core courses and submitted to the Instructional Assessment Coordinator. General Education Competency Committees process.

The method used is entitled "Institutional Portfolio Model" and was developed at Johnson County Community College. The method employs annually assessing 100 embedded assessments of existing course assignments from across the college for those students who have completed at least 30 credit hours. The student work (artifacts) are assessed based on rubrics. The rubrics used to assess the four general education competencies (communication both written and oral, critical thinking, mathematics, and technology literacy) are designed and used by committees comprised of faculty.

We are assessing core completers using the ETS Proficiency profile.

The Assessment Team for SACS, chaired by the VPI, have discussed and reviewed the ETS-Proficiency Profile and the CAPP instrument for the measurement of general education competencies. We, as a group, will decide which instrument to use for collecting data on those students who have completed at least 37 credit hours of general ed curriculum.

Currently, we are utilizing the following processes: (1) Seeking student opinions via the Community College Survey on Student Engagement (CCSSE) (2) Administration of the Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) (3) Our Core Curriculum Committee is currently discussing additional assessment techniques for general ed competencies - assessment that will be incorporated into current course syllabi and activities.

Developed at department level

The instructional departments identify a limited number of student learning objectives to assess from the core academic areas. Direct measures are identified to assess the outcomes. Indirect measures are used to assess the general success of graduates.

For its courses that are either in the Core Curriculum or are required for a degree in that particular field, each program identifies the general intellectual competencies such as reading or critical thinking, that are taught. Every year, each department then selects an assessment instrument that it deems most appropriate to evaluating the extent to which students in these courses are achieving those competencies. Given the incredible diversity and large number of courses involved, most programs choose to assess some portion of the courses in their purview each year, rotating between courses on a regular cycle. The department chair for each program is responsible for entering the assessment method, results, and the ensuing improvement plan into a common, accessible database. It is the goal of this process to ensure that assessment is both meaningful and effective.

Each department assesses general education competencies during the fall and spring semesters. Courses and competencies are selected on a rotating schedule that allows all courses and competencies to be assessed on a minimum 5-year schedule. Assessment data are submitted to IR&E for database entry, and results are produced each semester and posted online for faculty, staff, and administrative review.
Each department/division plans for assessment activities based upon outcomes established by the Texas Higher Education Board. An Assessment Committee reviews data, which goes to the Institutional Effectiveness director. Faculty evaluate data and then make appropriate changes in learning activities.
A quality assurance committee reviews each departments assessment and follow-up.
Appropriate departments use embedded questions and various holistic assignments to evaluate exemplary educational objectives. Perspectives are evaluated using individual oral exams, conducted by members of the gen. ed. assessment committee. Competencies for transfer graduates are evaluated using the CAAP test and holistic assignments in sophomore English courses. Gen. ed. competencies for workforce graduates are evaluated using multiple measures of assessment in capstone courses within each workforce program.
Pre and post tests in general education/core curriculum courses. Departmental exam with embedded questions. Evaluation of all institutional programs and disciplines on a 5 year cycle.
- In-Class Assessment by faculty - GPA - MAPP (ETS standardized testing) - Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Day - Instructional Unit Review
Discipline Level: Faculty members develop and administer course-embedded common assessments. Data are analyzed at least annually by discipline faculty as the basis for continuous improvement action plans. Institutional Level: Discipline-based expected student learning outcomes are mapped to the THECB's basic intellectual competencies, exemplary educational objectives, and perspectives. Each year, a sample of first-time-in-college students complete the CCLA, and their scores are compared to a corresponding sample of essentially core complete students to holistically assess learning gains in reading, writing, critical thinking, and computer literacy.
[We use] the WorkKeys Reading, Writing, and Listening for Information tests as a pre-test at the semester of entry via a mandatory College Success Skills Course and then as a post-test at the semester of graduation via each program's capstone course. This serves as the Direct Measure of Student Learning Outcomes in our Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) with SACS. In addition, each general education course completes a pre-test and post-test each semester for all General Education courses taught on our campus.
The College conducts program review every five years and course assessment is included in the review. Additionally, the last review of the core curriculum included assessment of general education competencies.
The most specific way is through Core Course Evaluations for each course listed in the Core. These evaluations are standardized across campuses across the district. Core Evaluations (projects, papers, pre/post tests, rubrics) are given in all sections every semester. The CAAP test is also administered in Math, Science, and English courses annually. The CCSSE is also administered to a sample of students every even year.
[We] use a variety of direct and indirect methods of assessment. In addition to classroom projects, tests and assignments, we use the CAAP test. Each transfer degree candidate is required to take the test as a part of the graduation requirements. The school also uses the CSSE and program reviews to assess the general education competencies.
Faculty members identify outcomes in their course syllabi. Selected outcomes are assessed, an assessment report is given to the department chair. That report is reviewed by the department chair, then given to the dean where it is reviewed again. In the report, the faculty member identifies the outcome, assessment results and changes to be made. Each semester, a report is prepared by the Institutional Research office that combines measures from many different sources (MAPP, CCSSE, IDEA, THECB, local surveys, etc.). Results that demonstrate the college's current status in the core areas (reading, writing, listening, speaking, computer literacy, critical thinking plus math) are included. This report is presented to the Academic Council (which serves as the general education assessment committee). Each week, the college's administrative staff meets to discuss current and future projects. During this meeting, any of the administrative staff members (President, Chief Academic Officer, Dean of Instruction, Dean of Institutional Research and Technology, Dean of Student Services or Dean of College Advancement - who is in charge of distance learning) can present reports or identify issues that concern general education competencies. Basically, [we] assess general education competencies at multiple levels, ranging from the instructor level to the administrative staff level. Additionally, at each of the monthly meetings, one of the administrators presents an "Education Report" to the College's Board of Trustees.

<p>Faculty establish learning outcomes and assessment methodology for General Education courses, with oversight by the Core Curriculum Evaluation Committee. Indirect assessment is provided by the Dean of Institutional Research through use of Noel Levitz, CCSSE, and other student success data. The Deans and VPs review the results of the data for college impact/assessment. Direct assessment is performed at the classroom level and is reviewed by the faculty in conjunction with the deans.</p>
<p>Exemplary objectives of the core are assessed through various assessment activities using a newly developed learning assessment instrument. Although various approaches were used the instrument helps capture all of the applied techniques and processes.</p>
<p>Faculty members prepare course-based Student Learning Outcomes based on the Core EEO's and CCIC's. They use document assessments, results, and interventions or changes to foster continuous improvement of student success. We are currently refining our process for documenting program level outcomes based on the Core Competencies. We are using Curriculum Mapping as a diagnostic tool, and we are using a variety of methods to evaluate outcomes of student near completion of our degrees.</p>
<p>The State of Texas has a mandated 42 semester credit hour Core Curriculum that must be embedded in all degrees. We use it as our general education requirements. The state has also specified core competencies that should result from the completion of the Core. Courses within the Core are analyzed to determine which of the Core competencies are taught in those courses and how. A variety of assessment methods (sample of course work, pre and post tests, etc.) are then used to determine if students are learning the competencies.</p>
<p>Student learning outcomes are identified and assessed for each core curriculum course. These are cross-referenced with the Basic Intellectual Competencies and the Exemplary Educational Objectives identified by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. Student learning outcomes are assessed at the course level through a variety of methods, primarily pre-test/post-test and course rubrics.</p>
<p>All students following degree plans must successfully complete at least one course in each of the following categories associated with six general education competencies - written communication, oral communication, reading comprehension, mathematical skills, computer literacy, and critical thinking: (1) ENGL 1301 or ENGL 1302 - reading comprehension, written communication, and critical thinking; (2) MATH 1314 or MATH 1414 - mathematical skills and critical thinking; (3) SPCH 1311 or SPCH 1321 - oral communication and critical thinking; (4) COSC 1301 or ITSC 1301 - computer literacy. Each student learning outcome in each course is tied to one or more of the associated general education competencies. Twenty percent of all sections of the listed courses are randomly selected to report, student-by-student, on student learning outcomes. Mastery of student learning outcomes is correlated to the individual students' final grades. Statistical analyses aggregate data by letter grade, by outcome, and by general education competency.</p>
<p>In addition to our Academic Course Requirements [Composition I and II, Mathematics, Science, Social/Behavioral Science], writing and math skills are used and assessed in most technical courses. These technical courses require reports and presentations in addition to requiring calculations to complete assignments</p>
<p>Each course has defined learning outcomes with appropriate assessment and scoring criteria. The appropriate course learning outcomes are associated with general education competencies. Each semester faculty submits learning outcome data for all courses and all students. The information gathered is used to analyze/assess not only general education competencies but also program and course curricula.</p>
<p>The general education faculty have identified course-specific learning outcomes and measures that would demonstrate student competencies identified in the THECB Core Principles. These measures include embedded assessments, classroom projects, grading rubrics, pre and post tests, and proficiency exit exams.</p>
<p>Currently it is solely through embedded assessments</p>
<p>Gen Ed has been assessed by embedded questions or projects at the course level, using the EEOs as the outcomes. To date no assessment across the curriculum has been done.</p>
<p>Based on the assessment technique identified in the syllabus, artifacts are collected and evaluated by rubrics.</p>
<p>We completed the state's Core Curriculum Assessment Plan several years ago, with an ad hoc, faculty committee completing the plan and initial report. The majority of activities are done "in-course," rather than at the program level. Currently we are completing a report on our first years of activity (and results) and will revise our overall assessment plans in a more program-wide direction.</p>
<p>Learning outcomes are identified and courses are built based on these outcomes. Faculty use outcomes to build course objectives. Students are assessed periodically on learning outcomes. End of course assessment encompasses the broad range of learning outcomes.</p>
<p>Faculty identify a set of general education outcomes that are delivered and assessed in "core courses".</p>

Assessment data is collected from the courses on an annual basis, analyzed, and used for improvement both at the course and institutional level.
Faculty determines how competencies are measured and collect data each semester on core courses. The Assessment Team uses a 4-point scale rubric to assess the assessment of competencies and provides detailed feedback as needed.
General Education competencies are assessed by the following process: All instruction is part of a continuous improvement process that consists of collecting/evaluating instructional data, implementing strategies of change, and measuring results. Each course is ascribed specific learning outcomes, and assessments are designed to specifically target and address learning outcomes. Learning outcomes are cross-walked with course assessments to assure the quality of competencies. When an opportunity arises for instruction to be improved, changes are implemented and results are measured. All records in the continuous improvement process are reported in notebooks which are reviewed by the General Education Program Chair, as overseen by the Associate Vice-President of Learning Success. Learning Outcomes and Course Competency mastery is assessed utilizing traditional educational methods, such as tests, quizzes, homework assignments, oral presentations, and collaborative projects. Program Chair observation of courses is also part of the assessment of General Education competencies. The Program Chair oversees syllabus development, which is approved by the Associate Vice-President of Learning Success and the Vice-President of Student Learning. Also, the Program Chair performs classroom evaluations once per year to assure quality instruction. Classroom visits are an embedded portion of the instructor evaluation process. In addition, students report their views of the course they participate in via End-Of-Course Surveys. End-Of-Course surveys are conducted each Fall and Spring semester, and the results are examined by the Associate Vice-President of Learning Success, General Academics Program Chair, and by individual instructors.
The general education core has been developed so that each student completing the core will have attained intellectual competency in reading, writing, speaking, listening, critical thinking, and computer literacy. Faculty have established student learning outcomes for all core courses that collectively will produce the above intellectual competencies. These learning outcomes are assessed for each student in each course in each semester. Reports on student learning outcomes mastery are produced annually and the results drive our curricular changes and associated budgets.
Measures, assessments, and use of data are reported using the Nichols five column model.
In addition to reviewing any core curriculum changes recommended by the discipline-specific curriculum teams, the core curriculum committee is also responsible for drafting the assessment plan for the core curriculum. At present, this plan requires the curriculum teams, each semester, to select sections representing at least 25% of the courses in the discipline that are included in the core. The instructor teaching a selected section is then asked to document how a core curriculum basic competency or perspective is addressed, how the faculty member determined that students had achieved the competency, and how many students achieved the competency. Faculty are instructed to leave blank a competency or perspective that is not addressed in the class and they are urged to use multiple assessment methods for each competency or perspective. The curriculum teams then compile the faculty documents and submit a summative report before the conclusion of the next semester.
As a community college, the Chief Academic Officer, The Institutional Research Officer who also has duties of Institutional Effectiveness for SACS Guidelines are the offices most responsible for assessing general education and core curriculum.
The college has a Core-SLO Committee made up of two faculty members and the VPI. The Committee disseminates assessment information to help faculty develop and implement assessments. The assessment process is a faculty driven process.
[We are] currently developing its general education assessment process.
We are in the process of changing after consultation with our SACS site team. We will use student portfolios (they will be complete for graduates in Spring, 2010), common assessments, grading rubrics, licensure exams as applicable, and data from transfer institutions. We are also going to form an academic advisory council to meet in the spring, 2010 semester. We will use student focus groups, student satisfaction surveys (CCSSE), and business and industry surveys.

We are currently reviewing and revising this process but we have incorporated the Core Curriculum Assumptions and Defining Characteristics Documents' Exemplary Objectives and Basic Intellectual Competencies as appropriate into our Syllabi and tie those concepts to our course objectives and course assessments. We use the matrices to ensure that all items are covered by our core curriculum and use the course assessments to evaluate both student and overall core curriculum effectiveness. We are working to better assess student learning by incorporating embedded questions to both major tests and final exams and pre and post test formats. We have considered using some form of comprehensive assessment but have not determined how to manage the cost or how to motivate students to provide their best effort short of tying the exam to graduation which we would like to avoid.

[We are] currently reviewing the manner in which general education competencies are assessed, with the intent of updating the process and implementing strategies found successful in best practices methodologies. Up to this point the college has used faculty content experts to review course competencies to ensure the intended general education criteria are adequately covered in the 42 hour core. In addition, students and faculty respond to specific prompts with respect to their experience with courses in the core curriculum. The feedback provided from this data collection is used to critically assess whether or not the core is providing the students with the competencies intended by the course selection.

[We are] in the process of beginning to assess our general education competencies. We have rewritten our District syllabi so that all of them have measurable objectives and objectives that address the general education competencies. We have Student Outcomes Assessment Plans (SOAPs) that individual faculty use to measure student outcomes in their courses. We have just finished the process of adopting seven Institutional Student Learning Outcomes and are beginning the process in the next year of mapping these across our curriculum so that we can discover the locations to begin objectively measuring and collecting data for these general education outcomes.

We are in the midst of re-vamping our general education student learning outcomes and the assessment strategies. Currently, we use the core curriculum as defined by the State of Texas, and we have unit plans which include core curriculum assessment rubrics.

Please describe one or two practices used by your institution to assess general education competencies that you consider to be working well.

agreement on general education/core curriculum learning outcomes
1. A well-defined set of general education outcomes, coupled with course-embedded assessments. 2. A framework of common-master syllabi used by all faculty, which reiterate the general education outcomes.
embedded assessment
Course-embedded assessment
Embedded Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) assessment within courses.
The course-embedded learning objectives process has produced identifiable results and improved curriculum. The semesterly report produced by the Institutional Research office and presented to the Academic Council provides useful feedback and helps the college to identify areas that could use improvement.
Linking the course learning outcomes with embedded course assessment and the general education competencies.
Tying assessment to course objectives and having faculty explain the connections via the syllabi.
We are using course notebooks to document samples of student work and to document a cross-listing of learning outcomes and assessments.
We are collecting data on course-based outcomes in the core curriculum. We are concurrently emphasizing "active learning" strategies and incorporating them into the improvement model. We are seeing early positive results.
Embedded questions on end-of-course exams
Math department - embedded common exam questions
We are currently assessing competencies based on course embedded assessment of competencies which apply globally to general education instruction. This practice allows faculty who are involved in the evaluation process to see how each discipline approaches the instruction of each the individual competency. The results of these evaluation sessions and the debriefing process that follows allows the faculty to utilize this information to determine improvements in instructional methods and strategies.
Student learning is included in institutional strategic planning. Artifacts are selected randomly across the curriculum, and faculty across the curriculum assess the content.
Rubric scored artifacts are drawn from across the curriculum.
1. Inter-disciplinary assessment of intellectual competencies - Assessing core completers in various disciplines, working with the discipline faculty to create content-appropriate assessment activities.
>Discipline-based statements of expected student learning outcomes, data analysis, and action planning >Faculty team-based assessment of student artifacts at the institutional level.
Common rubrics for capstone projects.
English 1301 - A common research project is assigned for all sections on all campuses each semester. Students are given 5 sources from a variety of types of materials. After reading the sources outside of class, students discuss the sources in class groups in 1 class period. The following class period, students write their research papers in class in a computer lab setting. The papers are then scored using a common rubric developed by the English faculty to assess the Core Competencies determined by THECB for core English classes and other agreed-upon competencies. Since the implementation of this common assessment tool, instructors in all sections have noticed several outcomes: 1) students are accomplishing the competencies more fully and more often, 2) weakness in instruction and/or lack of mastering competencies can be addressed in the following semester.



<p>1. Norming process for English 1301 composition yields more consistent grading across sections to better assess overall student strengths and weaknesses. 2. Speech department uses entry and exit rubrics for assessing student performance and has developed a listening assessment to measure student proficiency in this core principle.</p>
<p>1. Writing - Student writing artifacts are collected; readers are trained how to read and grade using our writing rubric. Each artifact is read by 3 evaluators. A mastery score is pre-determined. The % of mastery is determined and recommended action is developed. 2. Speaking - Student speeches are videotaped and are later viewed by trained reviewers using a rubric. Each speech is heard by 3 evaluators. Results are reviewed and action recommended.</p>
<p>SPCH 1311: Faculty members in all sections designed instructions for students to present a persuasive speech with outline and Power Point presentation. Speakers submit printed materials and are videotaped for later evaluation by a panel of instructors. Use of a rubric to standardize responses has revealed areas of instruction designated for improvement. CHEM 1405: Once each academic year, students complete a laboratory exercise: "Quantitative Analysis: Acid Base Titration with Volumetric Dilution." The lab is graded by faculty members using a standardized rubric. HUMA 1315: Students are required to write an essay to a standardized prompt for a grade in the course. The essay is an analytical critique of a work of art which is graded with a rubric. The work group analyzes the data for areas of weakness, integrating feedback into improvement of instruction.</p>
<p>Embedded course assessment and end of semester portfolio evaluations.</p>
<p>Student portfolios have been collected for a year now, so at the end of the spring, 2010 semester, we anticipate being able to view a portfolio of work to track progress. We are also developing rubrics that will help faculty assess students' learning in general and give some consistency to expectations.</p>
<p>The portfolio process that is used to assess the EEO's in the Humanities/Visual and Performing Arts core has proven to be effective.</p>
<p>Our in-course pre-post tests are good for evaluating learning gains. Some existing practices (such as speeches in speech courses) could be easily "cross-assessed" to evaluate student skills in information or computer literacy, for example.</p>
<p>Our institution uses pre and post testing in science and math core components, while common rubrics are used in liberal arts classes.</p>
<p>standardized pre and post tests in general ed/core curriculum courses</p>
<p>The WorkKeys pre-test / post-test has become ingrained into the culture of the institution and is no longer questioned or the object of complaints by the faculty after four years.</p>
<p>Health careers use clinicals and state exams. Industrial technology programs use certifications. These all include ability to use applied mathematics/reading/writing skills.</p>
<p>CAAP, holistic assessment of competencies in sophomore English courses</p>
<p>1. Standardized testing. 2. Results of students that transfer to four year institutions.</p>
<p>Use of THECB resources as indirect measures, ie Academic transfer report</p>
<p>Student success and retention data is used in annual faculty evaluation as well as discipline and program review. This helps focus on the importance of student success. We also embed across the curriculum initiatives in the evaluation of the core.</p>
<p>Program Review is working well but could be improved. Standardized exams in key areas (Dev. Engl for example)</p>
<p>We are incorporating the assessment of general education competencies into program reviews which are completed on a three-year cycle. Department chairs work with faculty members in their area to gather data on student learning outcomes.</p>
<p>The best practice we currently have is use of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), a district-wide survey that randomly selects students for response.</p>
<p>Student focus groups have been effective in a variety of situations, and likely will be a central element of the final design of the general education assessment model.</p>

Use of assessment committee to establish forms and the development of the cycle for all steps. Representatives on the committee from all six instructional divisions.
1. Core Curriculum Evaluation Committee tracks course level SLO assessments 2. SLO Faculty Coordinators train and lead SLO assessment efforts.
Rubric to assess assessments IE tied to budget
Student Learning Outcomes Handbook serves as a reference about how learning outcomes should be written and measured.
The college is trying to more fully integrate the assessment of general education and other competencies into a more comprehensive system that ties into master planning.
The use of collecting and transferring samples into an electronic format works very well. We incorporate the use of Filebound software, an electronic document software used primarily by Admissions and Records Office, has allowed us to keep track of the samples that we collect. This also allows persons doing the assessment access to documents they are assessing via their office computers.
Locally developed software for tracking, disaggregating, and reporting on student mastery of course and program learning outcomes has made identification of curricular weaknesses easier to locate in addition to easing the data entry tasks faced by the full time and adjunct faculty.
1. Faculty Buy-in: Faculty-driven assessment approaches which are determined and fulfilled by the faculty. 2. Students Give Best Efforts: Student motivation is not required because the assessment process is transparent to students.
Adapting MLA or APA standards for technical reports (standards taught in Composition courses) tell students the seriousness or level of expectations for these technical reports.
Assessments based on learning outcomes work best.
I don't believe we do a good job.
This Spring 2010 semester will be the first time that these competencies have been measured.
We are just developing the process.
None to date.

Please describe one or two significant challenges that your institution faces in assessing general education competencies.

Getting all faculty to see the value of assessment Having FTE for assessment
Challenges we face include faculty buy-in of a skills-based rubric and ensuring that measurement practices are effective.
Requiring faculty to integrate student learning outcomes skill development and classroom assessment into their curriculum in a systemized and consistent manner without stepping on academic freedom.
Faculty buy-in and an understanding of how general education assessment overlaps with program assessment and provides quality improvement data.
Involving middle-level administrators in assessment.
Faculty commitment Faculty knowledge of assessment
It is incredibly frustrating trying to overcome the natural reluctance that many faculty have to doing the same thing, i.e. common test questions or common grading rubrics. It's made even more difficult by changing external requirements, ranging from changes in how outcomes are defined (upcoming, but slowly), to the continuing imposition of unfunded mandates that don't relate to student learning (putting all syllabi online, but not in Blackboard). It's all claimed to be crucial and required, but one seldom gets the sense that results are ever considered--regulators simply create more regulations.
Challenge I: Getting faculty behind the assessment process so that meaningful data can be collected. Challenge II: Devising effective strategies for evaluation that have meaningful measurements.
The greatest challenge is the "it is not my job" syndrome. In other words, most faculty feel their job is to teach the subject matter they were trained in.
It is a challenge to get faculty support across four different campuses and to gain consensus on how to assess learning outcomes.
Faculty buy-in, cost, and size of institution
Faculty buy-in to the process. Agreement on measures, targets and reporting results.
Beginning in Spring 2010, [we] will begin measuring learning outcomes in all sections of all courses taught by full-time faculty. There is much training to do and a voluminous amount of data to verify, so efficiently handling the data acquisition and verification will be a challenge with limited staffing. [The] College also faces the challenge of having instructors buy-in to the assessment of learning outcomes and general education competencies. In some cases instructors have sometimes either faked data; in other cases, instructors are careless about accurately reporting mastery of student learning outcomes; and in still other cases, some instructors have refused to submit a report at all. Dealing with the concerns is going to require the College to develop a culture where assessment of learning outcomes carries the same expectation as recording final course grades.
With the General Academics department being staffed by 80% adjuncts, it is challenging to maintain the same expectations for them as for full time faculty members.
1) Engagement of adjunct faculty 2) Resources (Human and Financial)
Generation of grading rubrics in technical courses employing report writing, presentations, etc. in the final course grade. Technical faculty need assistance in generating grading rubrics.
1. Changing to student learning outcomes 2. Expanding the faculty knowledge of direct measures.
Broader knowledge and experience of faculty and instructional supervisors regarding evaluation techniques for general education/core curriculum.
We need further clarification around the State of Texas core curriculum and general education student learning outcomes. Nationally, there is difficulty designing assessment strategies for learning outcomes at a macro level, rather than a classroom level.
We see a general confusion, on our campus and across the state, between general education (15 hours) which must apply to all degree plans (AA, AS, AAT, & AAS) and core curriculum (42 hours) which applies only to transfer degree plans.

<p>One significant challenge in assessing general education competencies is that many of the people that should be involved in the process are unfamiliar with the ways in which learning outcomes at the course and program level tie into the larger fabric of general education competencies and the achievement of longer-term goals for the student. There is little communication between different programs, despite the obvious importance of, for example, math skills to science or writing skills to history. Addressing this challenge, however, pales in comparison to meeting the second, which is the understandable concern and fear that any kind of comparative assessment or reporting of student achievement can only lead to punitive responses, even when demonstrated and substantial improvements are made. One need look no farther than the devastating effect standardized testing has had on the public schools, where educators have been blamed for students being unable to meet specified learning outcomes, with no regard given for differences in resources, student background, family situation, or even student disabilities. So long as assessment is thus tied to punishment, rather than meaningful support for improvement, the resistance to assessment of any sort will be difficult to overcome</p>
<p>One challenge is to arrive at a consensus regarding the relationship/connection between program level student learning outcomes and general education student learning outcomes.</p>
<p>Faculty do not have adequate time to develop and assess SLO's.</p>
<p>Time to compile and evaluate results in a timely fashion</p>
<p>It is very labor intensive to maintain the process of General Education assessment via pre-test / post-tests and requires regular reminders of the importance of this process to both existing and new faculty.</p>
<p>The collection process and sampling process is somewhat time consuming. We do not have dedicated professional staff for this procedure.</p>
<p>1. Because evaluators are paid; there are monetary concerns. 2. Timely gathering and evaluating of artifacts. 3. Willingness of faculty to give up class time for in-class assessment.</p>
<p>1. Budget and adequate personnel are a problem in today's economy.</p>
<p>having funds available for assessment that compares our students' competencies with other institutions' students (CAAP); having the time to conduct assessment without significantly taking away time from instruction</p>
<p>Funding</p>
<p>resources and the challenge of analyzing and gathering data as an institution</p>
<p>lack of funding and staff to help with assessment</p>
<p>We do not have the funding for professionally- or nationally-developed programs that would help organize the information more easily. We also do not have the expertise that is necessary to develop best practices. The expertise is also a funding issue; we have the personnel who are willing to learn, but we cannot fund the training.</p>
<p>1. Personnel to collect and analyze data in a systematic way 2. Resources to purchase and implement Gen Ed Skills exams, such as MAPP or CLA</p>
<p>The staffing needs to process and analyze such large amounts of data coupled with the data entry requirements that a robust system places on faculty.</p>
<p>Staffing--not enough people to work with it especially in IR support. Another challenge is educating faculty on the importance of assessment and helping them become more knowledgeable.</p>
<p>Needed staffing and monetary support. To have in place a strong faculty development program.</p>
<p>Money to purchase the standardized tests. Incentives to get students to perform at their best when testing is not tied to a grade or reward.</p>
<p>One area that is a challenge to assess is the Critical Thinking component. While we have defined what [we] consider as critical thinking it is hard to find a direct measure that captures data that indicates success. In addition, faculty and staff need to be educated on why assessment is the right thing to do and what the faculty should be doing with the data once it is collected.</p>
<p>The diversity of our course offerings restricts the range of activities which can be assigned for evaluation purposes which, in turn, limits the findings and strategies which can be developed. The flexible structure of our general education degree requirements give us limited opportunity to take advantage of course sequencing to develop advanced evaluation of competencies based on student's previous coursework.</p>
<p>1. Having instructors agree on what material to test, and 2. Agreement on how to test the material once agreed-upon.</p>
<p>&gt;Effective measures of student learning &gt;Effective operational definitions of expected student learning outcomes that align with reliable and valid measures</p>

Developing assessment methods that provide meaningful information for faculty.
Institutional assessment methods
Making sure we are assessing all competencies in a planned and strategic way. Trying to assess the EEO's established by the THECB - these are not measurable. They need to be rewritten so that action verbs are used, not "to understand" or "to recognize."
First challenge is having a cycle for assessment. Second, knowing what outcomes to assess. Perhaps a common list of outcomes in the ACGM similar to WECM. Currently the college references the exemplary objectives are the major outcomes to assess.
Being new to the institution, the glaring weakness is consistently using assessment results for improvement. We have now developed a process to systematically review results for improvement.
1. Specifying exactly (details) of what needs to be adjusted, in which courses, and how to quickly improve student performance in this regard. 2. Rewarding faculty who routinely spend extra time assessing our college-wide, embedded assessment of general education competencies
User-friendly format for collection and data analysis. Currently ours is paper intensive.
The central challenge is to develop measurements that are easily collected by faculty in a centralized data storage system that will produce usable reports for analysis and planning.
1. Getting graduates to take an exit assessment. 2. Expanding the use of departmental final exams.
We would like to utilize some type of general knowledge and skills exam prior to graduation but have not decided the best way to garner participation.
Student body is predominately part-time. Options in the general education courses at the sophomore level is extensive.
At present, there is a wide range of definitions of general education competences. Some of the areas (listening and speaking) are difficult to measure. Most of the other areas can be measured by a standardized test. One way to measure competency is to identify how well our students perform after they leave. Information is available for some of the students but not for all. Some of our students are inmates, so there is no information on how well they perform. Other students (especially our athletes) move on to other states. Information on how well our students do after their experience at [our college] would be most helpful. Since we are an "open-enrollment" institution, we accept students who may have to take only developmental-level courses in the first semester. Some of these students never achieve competency in the general education courses but do learn time-management, independence and other life-skills that help them to become productive citizens. One of the challenges occurs because there is much more that is taught in college besides general education competencies. We need a way to measure total growth as well as general education competency.
Another major challenge is that students "swirl," they take courses in random order in spite of advising and/or degree plans, and at multiple institutions. Music and engineering students end up taking general ed courses as seniors whereas many other take them as freshmen and sophomores. Community colleges should be allowed to offer a complete core curriculum with a designated "capstone" course in which assessment of general ed could be completed. We are looking at the model that Dallas County Community College District recently adopted whereby they will utilize GOVT 2302 as their "capstone" course.
Transitory student body makes it difficult to hold any one institutional accountable
As a district, we are in the process of developing our new core; we believe that when it is in place, its "Tier Three" course will be important to us as an assessment venue. Right now we are somewhat "on hold" waiting the completion of the process.
[We are] currently moving from Exemplary Educational Objectives to Course Learning Outcomes. This change is being done to create relationships between course learning outcomes and exemplary educational objectives, intellectual competencies and perspectives.

HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY INSTITUTE  
A Project of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board

General Education Assessment  
Practices Survey 2009

Responses to Open-Ended Questions  
Four-Year Institutions

## Four-Year Institutions

Please briefly describe the process through which your institution assesses general education competencies.

<p>The Undergraduate Council Subcommittee on Core Curriculum is responsible for on-going assessment planning; assisting in data collection and data analysis; and requesting or suggesting curricular improvements. Members represent departments that have courses in the core and they work collaboratively with department chairs and other faculty. The Dean of the College of Arts &amp; Sciences provides leadership support and guidance in all phases of assessment as does the Office of the Provost. The AVP of Assessment &amp; I.E. serves as an ex officio member and provides assessment support and resources.</p>
<p>A general education assessment committee consisting of a central committee and subcommittees that include faculty and staff representing the various competencies assessed has been the primary vehicle for assessing general education competencies.</p>
<p>Our GE Advisory Committee is responsible for the program's assessment as well as other aspects of the program. They have developed and maintain an assessment plan for the program that plans and schedules assessment activities for our GE learning outcomes. Though the responsibility for assessment of the program is theirs, they are encouraged to recruit other faculty and staff members to help in various aspects of these efforts. Each year a report is written describing the assessment and program improvement activities that have occurred in the past year.</p>
<p>We have a core curriculum assessment committee with representatives from all colleges participating in the core. This group is responsible for overseeing assessment of competencies in all core courses. Within each college there are faculty teams that collaborate and organize assessment at a local level. The AVP Assessment provides analysis of CLA and NSSE findings; the AVP Core Curriculum produces an annual report in consultation with the core assessment committee.</p>
<p>Collects both external information and internal embedded student learning documentation on general education student learning priorities each year and reports those outcomes in WEAVE on-line. Separate faculty committee for general education curriculum and assessment reviews data and determines effectiveness of general education curriculum.</p>
<p>The CCC makes a schedule for assessment of core areas, reviews core competencies, chooses means of assessment, and reviews findings. The Institutional Research and Effectiveness office advises and makes recommendations about assessment as well as helping to analyze data. The Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education has the overall responsibility for the process.</p>
<p>For many years, our institution has evaluated students' writing skills by administering the institutionally developed Writing Proficiency Exam. Students are required to pass this examination or pass ENGL2113 Composition Skills course which evaluates their writing competency. Also, every two years, our institution participates in NSSE. We have only participated in one administration of the NSSE and will be able to determine better uses for the data obtained after our 2010 participation in the survey. Additionally, our institution is currently examining an assessment model that would use both the ACT and the CAAP standardized tests in order to evaluate student's success as a result of our general education program.</p>
<p>Assessment is based on Student Learning Outcomes derived from THECB Exemplary Objectives. Faculty teams in each Component Area developed SLOs, identified Methods of Assessment, set Criteria for Success, collect data and analyze results. Writing--Essay at end of ENG 1302, random sample graded by team of faculty using a rubric developed by faculty; Mathematics, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Humanities and Visual &amp; Performing Arts--embedded questions on final examination in all courses that may be taken by students in this component; Use the Collegiate Learning Assessment to assess critical thinking, logical reasoning, problem solving and writing as value-added.</p>
<p>CAAP Exam given each spring, varying areas assessed each year. CLA given in the fall (Freshmen) and Spring (Seniors). Graduating student survey given each graduation (three times a year). Alumni survey given every two</p>
<p>The Core Curriculum Committee annually conducts the Online Senior Assessment to assess general education competencies. In addition, each of the seven core areas conducts its own internal assessments on an annual basis.</p>

In terms of outcomes, endorsed by the Faculty Senate, the Provost, and the President, they are listed below along with multiple measures, both direct and indirect. A graduate will: 1.) Master the depth of knowledge required of a discipline. 2.) Demonstrate critical analytical skills. 3.) Communicate effectively in writing and speaking. 4.) Provide ethical leadership in a global and diverse society. (Since this textbox does not support the formatting of a table, note that semicolons separate column information.) Column Headings: Time; Evaluations; Outcomes Measured 1) Annually for the first three years—then biennially; Writing Assessment Project; 3. 2) Annually for the first three years—then biennially; Critical Thinking Assessment Test (CAT) ; 2. 3) Biennially; National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE); 2,3,4. 4) Annually; Employer Assessment of Academic Preparation of CO-OP Students (Career Services); 1,2,3,4. 5) Annually; Leadership Development through Participation in Extra-Curricular Activities; 4. 6) Annually; Leadership Development through Participation in Service Commitments; 4. 7) Annually; Graduation Survey; 2,3,4. 8) Annually-Spring; Apply Rubrics to Student Research Week Presentations; 1,2,3. 9) Annually; Study Abroad Participation; 4. 10) Annually; Core Competencies Aligned and Associated with Program-level Student Learning Outcomes; 1,2,3,4. Following the implementation of measures, findings are reviewed and discussed by the assessment liaisons from all ten colleges, the Provost Office, Undergraduate Studies, Study Abroad, Student Affairs, and the Core Curriculum Council of the Faculty Senate.

Core Curriculum Assessment 1. Assessment of Core Competencies Reading, critical thinking, writing: standardized testing of core competencies (such as reading, writing, critical thinking) every third year. In addition, to assess writing, additional course embedded assessment for core writing courses is required as indicated under core content areas below. Data are gathered and analyzed centrally. Oral Communication: Use of common rubrics for oral presentations in non-speech classes or successful completion of speech class. Rubrics are collected and analyzed centrally (Office of Undergraduate Studies) and results communicated with departments in order to address needs for improvement. [No assessment of listening.] Computer Literacy: Use of common competency exam or successful completion of designated course in computer science. If students do not pass the exam after two attempts, they must take an approved course. 2. Assessment of Core Content Areas (Communication, Math, Natural Sciences, Humanities/ Visual & Performing Arts, Social & Behavioral Sciences, Multicultural Women’s Studies) Accomplished on a rotating cycle every four years, using core course-embedded measurements such as common exams, common portions of exams, common rubrics for portfolio assessments, or other common instruments for evaluating core learning outcomes across multiple sections and/or courses where possible. We are beginning the second year of this assessment which serves to assure alignment of courses with core learning outcomes and assess learning near the end of the instruction. Data are gathered and analyzed centrally, reviewed with departments and with deans. Each department is responsible for developing and implementing plans for improvements based on these assessments. Math, Science, and Writing: Trend comparisons of course embedded assessments (and course pass rates) with scores on standardized tests will be done to consider the degree of achievement locally in comparison with national norms. 3. Overall In the fifth year a comprehensive review of all assessment data is planned and the whole assessment plan will be reviewed and revised if needed.

We assess in-coming freshmen and outgoing seniors using standardized assessment instruments on several of the outcomes. Other outcomes are measured through portfolio assessments, capstone experiences and departmentally generated assessment strategies. These are discussed by faculty in annual assessment day meetings in spring semester in order to plan for the necessary changes during the next academic year based upon assessment information.

The Core Curriculum Assmt Committee consists of key faculty, Dept Heads and or Deans, the University Director of Institutional Research and Assessment and an Associate VP for Academic Affairs (representing the VP of Academic Affairs/Provost). The Associate VP serves as Chairperson. This committee proposes, considers and selects assessment strategies and agrees upon implementation processes for those strategies, with careful consideration of THECB directives and recommendations vis a vis instructional delivery and student learning outcome (SLO) objectives. Current assessment strategies include the measurement of pre-specified SLOs using both direct assessment and indirect assessment. Student performance products are systematically sampled from core curriculum courses with locally constructed rubrics, developed and internally standardized by groups of faculty within Core Curriculum disciplinary clusters. Indirect assessment of student-reported progress re. specific SLOs is conducted on data collected through the IDEA class evaluation system. each semester for each core curriculum class. Indirect assessment results for the Core Curriculum date back to FY 2006. Direct assessment strategies were first implemented in FY 08.



<p>IR and IE are the same office, and fall under the umbrella of the Provost's Office. IR/IE staff facilitate a process whereby faculty define standards for core competencies, write rubrics, provide randomly selected samples of embedded student work, and assist in the scoring process. IR/IE staff analyze the data and submit it back to faculty for interpretation and action.</p>
<p>Departments are responsible for assessing achievement of gen ed competencies of their graduates at both the associate and bachelor degree levels. Most departments use projects and papers from senior seminars and capstone courses to assess the six intellectual competencies. Our GEAC oversees the process that involves faculty serving on department or program assessment committees. GEAC is responsible for development of rubrics, timeline, and collection and storage of artifacts. Students in each exit level course must submit a copy of their final project for evaluation by the department/program assessment committee. A random sample of these final projects is also evaluated by GEAC. The GEAC's report is submitted to the VPAA. These final projects is also evaluated by GEAC. The GEAC's report is submitted to the VPAA.</p>
<p>This is the process we have been following for the last five years -- it is likely to change significantly once new guidelines are in place from THECB. 1) Department chairs completed surveys indicating which of the EEOs were taught and assessed in each core course administered by their department. 2) The Chair of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, a Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, and the Director of IRPE examined the survey results and picked several core courses in various subject areas that covered the EEOs in which to conduct assessment. 3) To prepare for the first year of assessment, the same group worked with the Dean and Department Chairs in the College of Science (Biology, Chemistry, Geology, Physics and Mathematics) and the Chairs of English and Communications to familiarize them with the task ahead, of assessing the EEOs in Natural Sciences, Mathematics, and Communications (written and oral). The chairs received training and examples of course-embedded assessments to use in developing the process for their courses. Most chairs chose to map various exam questions to the EEOs as their method of assessment. In Communications, however, rubrics were developed to assess improvement in writing skills and students' performance in oral presentations. 4) In 2005-2006, the selected departments were to conduct their planned assessments in the selected courses and send the analysis to the Director of IRPE. The process continued in 2006-07 with the chairs of Anthropology, Economics, History, Political Science and Sociology assessing the EEOs for Social/Behavioral sciences and in 2007-08 with the chairs of Art, Music and Philosophy assessing the EEOs for Visual/Performing Arts. 5) The results of the assessments have been presented to the Undergraduate Assembly and summarized in written form.</p>
<p>Currently thorough departmental IE LOA reports. We are revising the process using curriculum mapping to develop a matrix of Learning Outcomes matched to THECB exemplary outcomes, which will use primarily embedded assessment methods, with results to be reported in six Gen Ed Modules in WEAVEonline.</p>
<p>Assessment takes place at the course level and at the university level. Course-based assessments are reviewed by a committee of the Faculty Senate. Institutional Research conducts assessment using national instruments that have been aligned with the expected outcomes.</p>
<p>Course-level pre-testing and post testing, and CAAP exam.</p>
<p>The General Education Council chaired by the Dean of University College reviews appropriate THECB policy and makes recommendations on appropriate competencies. They report to the Provost's Office. The competencies are assessed where introduced, reinforced and mastered in the core curriculum and reinforced in the academic programs. The results of the assessment at the academic program level are reported to the General Education Council by the appropriate administrators. Assessment of competencies in the general education classes are reported and assessed in a separate General Education site. Various faculty, students and administrators directly responsible for the assessment, review, revise, and revisit both the assessment strategies and the results of the assessment.</p>
<p>[We use] a course based embedded assessment system. Results of each courses' assessment are reviewed by the Core Curriculum Assessment Committee.</p>
<p>Assessment plans are developed to address the mission and goals of each core course and are linked to the student learning outcomes. Data are gathered and collected every semester from varied measures that include: common course exams (embedded questions) and common rubrics that are linked to General Education competencies. Analysis of data is conducted to determine levels of progress and any required corrective action.</p>

<p>Evaluated through course embedded measures.</p>
<p>General education competencies are assessed through the efforts of the Core Curriculum Committee. Committee members have used the characteristics of basic intellectual competencies in the core curriculum, the perspectives in the core curriculum, and the exemplary objectives of the core curriculum components as a basis for assessing the general education courses. Faculty has compared the exemplary objectives with their course objectives to determine their degree of alignment and have made changes, if needed. Faculty members have used different types of assessment instruments to assess students' ability to meet the desired learning outcomes. In addition, students' achievement in reading, writing, and mathematics is annually reported to the University Assessment Committee.</p>
<p>1. Faculty determine competencies/perspectives, submit - Gen Ed Comm (GEOC) 2. Faculty determine EEOs, state as SLOs for courses, submit to GEOC 3. Faculty determine assessment, review with Director of IE and/or GEOC 4. Faculty collect data, determine if target attained, use results to improve 5. Submit documentation to GEOC each semester course is taught 6. Director IE prepares report on extent of attainment for each EEO each year for GEOC. GEOC reports to Faculty Senate.</p>
<p>We are adding freshmen and sophomores fall semester 2010 and are in the process of developing procedures for assessing the core curriculum.</p>
<p>We are currently developing the core curriculum. We plan to incorporate all core courses into an online evaluation process with semester-based review of each core course.</p>
<p>The development of a coherent process is in progress, being developed by the Faculty Committee on the Core Curriculum.</p>
<p>As an upper level institution we do not assess general education competencies; however, upper level competencies are being assessed as part of the institution's QEP.</p>
<p>[We are] an upper level institution with only juniors and seniors. All our undergraduate students are transfers; most of them from community colleges. Many of the transfer students have already completed the majority of their core curriculum while with community colleges. [We do] not have a traditional general education curriculum. We do have core competencies developed by our shared governance and we assess those.</p>

Please describe one or two practices used by your institution to assess general education competencies that you consider to be working well.

Course-embedded assessments
Course embedded assessment used in Natural Sciences is working well. Database of over 60,000 questions with answers can be used to generate questions to test competencies of students semester after semester without compromising the questions.
Academic departments offering general education courses with assistance from the General Education Council and the Office of Academic Development and Assessment develop course embedded assessment instruments and rubrics that evaluate student success in meeting general education competencies and student learning outcomes. The results are reviewed by the Office of Academic Development and Assessment, the General Education Council, faculty teaching the courses, the academic departments or schools, the colleges, the associate deans of the undergraduate colleges who form an assessment advisory committee for purposes of compliance and process, and the Dean of University College. These various groups examine, review, revise and analyze the assessment data, and devise strategies to improve the assessment results in subsequent iterations.
Sampling course-embedded products of student learning and subjecting them to a common standard of assessment via a rubric consensually developed by faculty groups who teach and supervise those who teach core curriculum courses. Collecting student reported progress on targeted SLOs in core curriculum courses, in order to cross check student perception of learning with sampled demonstrations of learning
The Critical Thinking Assessment Test (CAT) is course-embedded and given in upper-division courses with mostly U4 students. Reports can be offered to the department regarding their students critical thinking, while results can be used towards an overall institutional report. The Writing Assessment Project (WAP) is a "home grown" process where sets of class papers are collected from upper-division, capstone, or upper-division writing intensive courses. A cross-sectional group of University faculty score the papers using a common rubric developed with the University Writing Center. Participating departments receive a department-level reports of their students' writing. All papers contribute to the overall institutional report of student writing. Student Activities sponsors Student Research Week in conjunction with the Graduate Student Council. Every participating student is scored by both a lay judge and a topic judge using a common rubric that includes writing, speaking, and critical thinking. These rubrics are collected by the Office of Institutional Assessment and analyzed for the quality of student work related to the Core Competency outcomes.
Taping oral presentations in speech for oral communication skills, and evaluation of products against standard rubrics.
We utilize both a writing and oral presentation rubric which provide a good assessment of the student's communication skills.
Assessment of writing in ENGL 1301 and 1302 using a standard assignment and rubrics to score essays
Assessment of writing using common rubric - independent, blind, review by two faculty per writing sample.
We have established a year-long writing experience for our freshmen students with ENGL 1301 – Freshman Composition I and ENGL 1302 – Freshman Composition II. Through extensive collaborative discussions, faculty developed common learning outcomes for each course and the use of a common analytical scoring rubric that is used to assess students' writing competency in each course. Faculty use the rubric to provide constructive feedback to students to improve their writing proficiency. ENGL 1301 and EMGL 1302 faculty hold regular meetings to discuss successes, challenges, and ways of meeting these challenges. College Algebra (MATH 1314) faculty have collaboratively developed a set of common learning outcomes and a common final exam. These faculty members also hold regular meetings to discuss successes, challenges, and ways of meeting these challenges.
English faculty review a sample of portfolios in composition using a rubric to evaluate writing courses in the core.
Some departments use portfolios. [We] recently developed a new set of institutional learning goals to operationalize learning assessment and guide program assessment.
1. Common Final Exams and/or pre- and post-testing 2. Student Portfolio
1) Competencies such as reading, critical thinking, and perhaps writing and math may be effectively evaluated/assessed with standardized tests; however, their results are hard to use for future improvements unless they are aligned with specific courses. 2) End-of-course exams are more useful when considering the results to make improvements.

Course-level pre-testing and post testing
Embedded course assessment and the use of standardized testing (MAPP).
The locally developed Online Senior Assessment has provided a wealth of data to the Core Curriculum Committee. The CLA is gaining more widespread recognition across campus as a useful tool.
Use of national instruments (CBASE, CAPP, CLA) allow comparison.
CLA and NSSE longitudinal studies
To assess critical thinking, we sample first year students in the Fall and administer the CCTST and the CAAP. In the spring, we administer the CCTST and the CAAP to a sample of graduating seniors who are enrolled in capstone courses and who are randomly selected. By doing this in classes, we have increased the response rate.
Have moved administration of MAAP from outside of class to part of course schedule in selected classes.
Use of class time for assessments work well as does completion of the graduating student survey at the commencement rehearsal.
Leadership and commitment are crucial to the success in assessing general education. The Deans provide excellent leadership at our university.
Assigning the AVP of AIE as an ex officio member to the subcommittee provides formal and informal dialogue and support for faculty who are responsible for assessing the core. Communicating with students through the student newspaper, town hall meetings, SGA, etc., has been an important step for educational outreach for students to understand the value of assessment (ongoing effort).
Faculty involvement in rubric development and scoring student work has been very fruitful. Faculty are interested and become more interested, often taking some of what is discussed or developed back to their own classrooms and to their interactions with colleagues.
Faculty driven process: Faculty are involved and responsible for development of assessment at department/program level. Authentic assessment: Emphasis is on course-embedded assessments. Professional development: One college sent faculty representatives from each department to an Assessment Conference. They in turn served on the College Assessment Committee.
Faculty survey: Online survey based on competencies included in GE LOs. Faculty are asked their opinions of the extent to which our graduating seniors have achieved these outcomes. It's indirect data, but we get pretty good participation from faculty and the questions cover all of our GE LOs, as they're written.
Assignment of one Assessment Coordinator per college, with a \$3,000 Special Assignment stipend, responsible for coordination and guidance of assessment in core curriculum and program assessment. Coordinators assist faculty in collecting and analyzing data, improving statements of student learning outcomes that are measurable, and in use of results.
1.) mapping curriculum to learning outcomes 2.) regular meetings of the "faculty resource group" comprised of faculty who teach core courses.
English Department internal review. Communications dept internal review
Currently in development.
At this time, our institution is developing a model for assessing general education, and therefore we have not had an opportunity to evaluate the success of our practices.

Please describe one or two significant challenges that your institution faces in assessing general education competencies.

Biggest challenges are (1) low level of interest and commitment on the part of faculty and some academic administrators, and (2) the fact that there's no identifiable group of faculty who feel that they "own" the GE program, and who therefore care deeply about its improvement in the same way they care about the programs in the own disciplines.
Faculty negative attitudes toward assessment.
1.) faculty fatigue 2.) large number of part time faculty
Since we don't have a traditional general education program, the results are not as meaningful to faculty.
Faculty understanding of the value of assessment. Infrastructure to make assessment seamless.
Faculty commitment Faculty knowledge of assessment
Faculty and department chairs have a lack of appreciation for the potential usefulness of assessment data.
Faculty and department chairs have a lack of knowledge about how to conduct assessments at the course level.
Developing a coherent and comprehensive plan based on evidence collected, and then getting the faculty from numerous departments to support the importance of the core curriculum and its continuous assessment and improvement. The diversity of instructors and their status (TA, part-time, full-time) is one of the greatest challenges in implementing a coherent program.
Faculty involvement and "buy-in" for assessment. Expertise in measurement of student learning outcomes. Analyzing results and using results of assessment to make improvements.
Faculty buy-in continues to be a challenge for assessment of the core. Adoption of a nationally-normed assessment instrument will be a challenge. We currently use the CLA, but are looking at other options.
Lack of faculty understanding that they are to teach cross disciplinary competencies such as critical thinking. Lack of adequate administrative emphasis on closing the loop as well as support for figuring out how to do that.
While good assessment methods for professional topics such as ethics are available, deciding whether to incorporate into existing courses or to have stand-alone courses is a major question. Finding faculty willing and able to cover these topics is challenging.
We have found that some faculty need additional assistance on how to formulate learning outcomes at different levels of the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains. They can also profit from additional preparation on how to develop and use both direct and indirect measures to assess these outcomes in effective and efficient ways.
We need more professional development on assessment, including writing student learning outcomes at course and program level and developing appropriate assessment measures. We also need strategies to distinguish and/or simplify the myriad assessment processes: general education, program level, institution level.
Time limitations of faculty to dedicate time to in-depth analysis of results for general education assessment in addition to time dedicated to their program results analysis and program action plans for improvement. Also, time limitations for professional development on assessment for faculty and staff.
Although course-embedded assessment is the most effective and authentic approach, the magnitude of the project is daunting and the faculty are not currently provided with appropriate training or released time.
The Cost of some measures Time related to administering tests and/or collecting student work and faculty scoring
1. Faculty time. Our determination to have faculty at the center of the process means we are asking them to spend time which is neither recognized nor rewarded by the promotion and tenure process. In fact, spending any significant time would cost tenure track faculty in this way. 2. Ownership. We do not have an undergraduate faculty, and the core in Texas is really a diffuse list of courses sorted by discipline with no organizing principles in the minds of either faculty or students. If core competency assessment results indicate action is needed, appropriate follow through is difficult to trigger without an obvious cross-disciplinary undergraduate faculty group to own it.
1. clarification of the connection between assessment and resource allocation. 2. faculty time and incentives vs. workload.

<p>The lack of uniformity and cohesion in measuring SLOs within those core curric areas which include course options crossing several disciplines. More concrete guidance would be appreciated from the State to assist disciplinary experts ( the active educators ) in those multi-disciplinary fields to work together to find more common ground for identifying common definitions of SLOs applicable across disciplines so that credible and valid, common, holistic rubrics could be developed and applied.</p>
<p>Student mastery of the general education competencies requires consistent reinforcement of the competencies so that the graduate will demonstrate the development of specific aspects of the competency that are most appropriate for particular academic program graduates. For example, oral communication is a competency introduced, reinforced and mastered as a part of the general education coursework, but academic programs have widely differing expectations of how the competency will be demonstrated in their respective graduates. Graduates in business or family and consumer sciences may be expected to demonstrate specific appearance criteria, whereas academic programs such as history or philosophy may not attach any importance to student appearance. Similarly, presentation style (eye contact, voice modulation, etc.) may be especially important for communication graduates but of little or no importance to scientists, but the scientists would attach much significance to the ability to clearly explain complicated visual images, whereas the communication studies faculty would expect standard forms of generalize slide presentations. These examples illustrate that competency assessment must occur at two levels--general education and academic program. The academic program faculty often complains that general education competencies don't meet their more specific expectations of the "same" competencies for their program graduates. Developing an ongoing conversation among the faculty and programs on these differing expectations is one of the most interesting challenges that confronts assessment of general education competencies.</p>
<p>First, developing a set of general education competencies that suit both our liberal arts and our professional colleges has been tedious, and therefore acquiring buy-in across the university has been difficult. Second, developing common assessment instruments for general education will be difficult.</p>
<p>Trying to develop the courses and assessment measures at the same time is proving most challenging.</p>
<p>We are instituting a new core curriculum in Fall 2011. This requires a review of all outcomes and related assessments. We adopted a set of overarching objectives for the full core in this process. We will be instituting course assessments in this new curriculum. The biggest challenge has been identifying course related assessments.</p>
<p>Too many competencies (18) based on Exemplary Educational Objectives across six domains. Number of courses that meet each core requirement provides significant challenges to develop common assessment measures for the outcome being assessed.</p>
<p>Assessing too often (which causes spillover effects on student engagement and faculty support); sample size issues 2. Turnover of faculty who teach core courses.</p>
<p>Dissatisfaction with department-level tests.</p>
<p>Insufficient participation by students.</p>
<p>Student participation in external assessment. Cooperation of departmental faculty in some areas, particularly with written communication.</p>
<p>Student participation in assessment activities and faculty buy-in to the overall assessment process.</p>
<p>There is always a fear that some students are not taking the assessment seriously, especially when they realize that poor performance has no direct consequences for them.</p>
<p>The primary challenge is the large proportion of undergraduate students who transfer-in hours on the core curriculum. Over 50% of recent bac graduates transferred in "core complete." Another significant proportion takes some degree of core outside of this institution. This is a major methodological as well as analytical issue.</p>
<p>The whole process!</p>